

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IV.

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1924.

Nos. 8 & 9.

Methodists Disavowing the Holiness People.

W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

The religious movement which has resulted in the organization of the so-called Pentecostal churches, vulgarly known as "Holy Rollers," is very frequently connected with the Methodist Church. The connecting link is the Methodist teaching of the perfect sanctification of believers through the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, either as a distinct gift after justification and essentially different from justifying grace, or as an increased measure of the Holy Spirit after justification. The bestowal of this special gift of the Holy Spirit gave rise to the name "Second Blessing," which became a sort of shibboleth with that particular class of Methodists who insisted on this bestowal as the distinguishing mark of genuine believers. John C. Montgomery, writing in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* (April, 1924, pp. 374—9), admits that Methodist teaching is at least indirectly responsible for the rise of the Pentecostal churches. He asserts that he has made a thorough study of the modern Pentecostal movement and has arrived at the following conclusion: "It will be found that the Second Blessing movement, so strong about a quarter of a century ago, prepared the way for the Pentecostal movement. That Second Blessing movement is our own. Its promoters made much of the inchoate pronouncements of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M., on this subject. Our preachers were their prophets, and our church-buildings were their refuge. There was a time when it was practically impossible to secure a Methodist evangelist to assist in a meeting without having a Second Blessing meeting. Many of our general evangelists were once of this group." Further on he says: "A devout old Methodist lady, mother of a prominent Methodist minister, described for the writer a Pentecostal meeting she had been attending. 'Why, brother, it is just like the old-time Methodist meetings. They had "the power." It was just like being in the meetings we used to have.' The Pentecostal people, with a great deal of gusto and ability to make a good case in the eyes of some

people, say: 'We are the old-time Methodists.' And we might as well admit that some things which we permitted to be regarded as the very essence of Methodism, in some quarters at least, mark the Pentecostal endeavors. Even if we had two kinds of Methodism, one for the rustics and the other for the urbanites, we have certainly had Methodists move to the city or another community and find nothing so much like their own brush-arbor revival-meeting Methodism as the Pentecostal services. They were a little emphatic and extreme, just carrying to logical conclusion and practising with consistency some of the things we tolerated and fostered."

This statement will be much appreciated outside of the Methodist Church, we think, first, because of its candor and sincerity, secondly, because of the doctrinal, or dogmatic, roots of the Pentecostal movement which it lays bare.

Wesley's spiritual development was not along purely evangelical lines, spite of the fact that he was the acknowledged leader in the so-called evangelical movement in England in his day. His earliest religious impressions of some depth were derived from the *Imitatio Christi* and *The Rules for Holy Living and Dying*. He states in his *Journal* that he learned from these works that "true religion was seated in the heart, and that God's Law extended to all our thoughts as well as words and actions." (I, 466.) Especially the latter work taught him the importance of "purity of intention." "Instantly," he says, "I resolved to dedicate all my life to God: all my thoughts and words and actions." (Wesley's *Works*, XI, 366.) A great hunger seized him for something that lay beyond his present experience: he felt no peace in his heart, but for thirteen years, filled with tragic experiences, he struggled with prayer and tears for that consolation which the pure Gospel alone can bestow. When he came to read William Law's *Serious Call* and *Christian Perfection* he claims: "The light flowed in so mightily upon my soul that everything appeared in a new view." (*Journal*, I, 467.) Still, the coveted peace did not come to him, although in his activity in the Holy Club at Oxford and in his efforts to preach the message of grace to the prisoners at the Castle and the Bocardo he was in a "passionate and unceasing quest for a deeper experience." When he entered upon his ministry in Georgia, he states in his *Journal*: "My chief motive is to save my own soul. . . . I hope to learn the true sense of the Gospel of Christ by preaching it to the heathen." (*Works*, XII, 38.) On his way across he expressed surprise that the Moravian passengers in his ship were quite unalarmed during a storm and even went on

with their singing. He marveled when one of them told him that his people were not afraid to die. W. Bardsley Brash relates the following incident: "Wesley landed at Savannah on February 6, 1736. He soon met Spangenberg, who asked him, 'Do you know Jesus Christ?' 'I know He is the Savior of the world.' 'True, but do you know that He has saved you?' 'I hope He has died to save me.' Spangenberg then asked, 'Do you know yourself?' Wesley answered, 'I do,' but, in telling the story of this conversation, says, 'I fear they were vain words.'" (*ERE*, XII, 725.) His unrest did not leave him during his incessant activity in the American colony. In his *Journal*, summing up his experiences, he calls himself "a child of wrath, an heir of hell," and in later years he revised this statement to read: "I believe not. . . . I had even then the faith of a servant, though not of a son." (I, 421.) In this state of mind he left Georgia at the end of 1737. He was constantly prying into his inner self and measuring his spiritual condition, his faith, against the standard of perfection. Every true evangelical sees at a glance where Wesley's trouble lay: he wanted to believe in himself believing and leading the life of faith. Hence the sense of dissatisfaction and the yearning for more Spirit, for a more comprehensive grasp of divine grace, for greater ardor in Christian living. "Eager and hungry, on his return to England he met Peter Boehler, who told him, 'My brother, my brother, that philosophy of yours must be purged away.' 'Preach faith till you have it, and then, because you have it, you will preach faith.'" (*ERE*, *ibid.*) This advice, though well meant, was not wise, for now Wesley would preach faith *because he had it*.

What happened to him on May 24, 1738, he has recorded in his *Journal*: "I think it was about five this morning that I opened my Testament on those words: 'There are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises.'" (Just before leaving his room his eyes fell on the text: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." In the afternoon he visited St. Paul's, where the anthem was "Out of the Deep have I Called unto Thee, O Lord.") "In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans*. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all my might for those who had in

a more especial manner despitefully used me and persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there what I now felt in my heart." (I, 475.) Was Wesley on this occasion made a Lutheran? He had indeed come under the influence of one of the finest instruments for a genuine evangelical conversion. He had learned the paramount lesson, that the faith which brings peace to the heart is the faith that personally appropriates the work of Christ. An excellent beginning in the right direction had been made. But even in this momentous hour we note that Wesley keeps his hand on his spiritual pulse: he knows the exact minute almost of his inward change; he records it as a sensation of which he was distinctly conscious, and last, not least, he notes that the change came to him immediately attended by works of sanctification which he performed. Is there anything wrong in this? Cannot the consciousness of the fact: Jesus saved me, just me, be flashed into a heart with such force, so vividly, that a person never forgets it all his life? That surely is possible and does not detract anything from the genuine spiritual quality of the event. Nor is justifying faith ever without good works, not even in the first moment. It must work by love at once, or it is not true faith. But it is a precarious situation which the justified sinner creates for himself when, reviewing the change that has been effected in him, he beholds both in one glance, the works which Jesus did for him and the works which he did the moment he grasped the reconciliation effected for him by the Lord. When remembering how he became God's child, the believer had better put altogether out of his mind how he behaved as God's child and rivet his attention exclusively on the vicarious works of his great Substitute; otherwise a pharisaical conceit, even of the faintest kind, will creep into his musings right at this point and spoil his whole evangelicalism. Only when the believer must prove to *men* that his faith is genuine, he may and must remember and appeal to his works of love. Peace with God such as the stricken conscience craves is obtained only on the basis declared in Rom. 5, 1. 2. Christ alone is our Peace, Eph. 2, 14; comp. John 16, 33. Only because He "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant," God is the God of peace. Heb. 13, 20; 1 Thess. 5, 23; 2 Thess. 3, 16. The peace established on Golgotha and laid as a benediction on the disciples in the Easter-greeting of the Lord is the *εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπερ-ἔχουσα πάντα νοῦν*, which "guards our hearts," Phil. 4, 7, like a sentinel at a door. That is the meaning of *φρουρεῖν*. This sen-

tincl does not suffer any other to share picket duty with him. If we appoint a sentinel of our own to secure God's sentinel, we shall always be looking for reports from our sentinel and trust our security to him.

The experience of Wesley at the meeting in Aldersgate Street did not effect a change in a theory of Christian perfection which he claims to have held uninterruptedly from 1725 to 1777. (*Works*, XI, 351—428.) One of the leading Methodist dogmaticians, William Burt Pope, of Didsbury College, Manchester, has exhaustively treated this belief of Wesley and his followers in his *Compendium of Christian Theology* (2d ed., New York, 1881, Vol. III, pp. 28—130); especially pp. 88—99 are important. It would lengthen this article far beyond the space at our disposal if we were to quote even a moiety of the interesting material contained in Pope's account. Perhaps we can take up this theory later in a special article. Meanwhile we must content ourselves with having referred the reader to the main source of information. In this connection we should also like to call attention to the criticism of Wesley's theory in C. Hodge's *Systematic Theology* and to Frederic Platt's article on "Perfection" in *ERE*, IX, 728—737. Wesley claims that the theory of perfection is "the grand depositum which God has lodged with the people called Methodists, and for the sake of propagating this chiefly He appeared to have raised us up." (*Letters*, Sept. 15 and Nov. 26, 1790.) Dr. J. A. Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary, claims that "the Methodists were the first Christians who officially, and as a united body, without deviation, and with the power of a Church behind them to make it effective, taught the New Testament doctrine of perfection." (O. A. Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, p. 525.)

In developing the theory of Christian perfection, which is "preeminently the distinction doctrine" of the Methodist Church, some of its advocates came to regard Christian perfection as "consisting in a new and distinct dispensation of the Spirit." (Platt.) They held that in order that the regenerate may become perfect in sanctification and in the service of love, not only a richer degree of divine grace than that previously bestowed is necessary, but there must be an entirely new gift of the Spirit, which can be distinguished in kind from the first gift received at regeneration and is superadded to the former. Some called this "the baptism of the Holy Ghost"; others, the "second blessing." (See A. Mahan, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, and the literature of the Pentecostal League.)

The Lutheran Church knows of Christian perfection only in the sense of perfection by imputation. It is the Redeemer's vicarious righteousness, acquired for men and written down to men's credit when God raised His Son for our justification, Rom. 4, 25, proclaimed by Christ's ambassadors as God's reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5, 19, 20, and accepted, appropriated, by faith, and thus turned into faith-righteousness, Rom. 4, 5. It is this righteousness which is without flaw; every other kind is, at best, a pressing forward to the mark of perfection. Methodists have ever failed to understand the Scriptural distinction between the believer's righteousness by justification, the *justitia imputata*, which is always 100 per cent., and his righteousness by sanctification, the *justitia acquisita seu inchoata*, which never is 100 per cent. That is why they have misunderstood and misjudged Lutherans so grossly as to pronounce and treat them as "unconverted," "dead-faith people," etc. But neither the plain assertions of Scripture nor the hard facts of the believer's life are changed by fervid, enthusiastic assertions of a plenitude of Spirit-force, Spirit-fire, Spirit-baptism such as Methodism has made and brought to a consistent conclusion in the Pentecostal movement.

The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, Dr. Carroll tells us, is a body formed 1907—08 by the union of several organizations of churches holding to the doctrine of entire sanctification as a work of grace distinct from, and subsequent to, justification. Independent holiness churches in New England associated themselves together as early as 1890. Subsequently a similar association was formed in New York, and these were united in 1897 under the name of "Association of Pentecostal Churches of America." In 1895 a body called "The Church of the Nazarene" was organized in Los Angeles, Cal. This, with similar congregations, resulted in an association. In 1906 a delegation from the Eastern body attended a general assembly of the Church of the Nazarene in Los Angeles to propose a union of the two bodies. The general assembly, finding that the Church of the Nazarene and the Pentecostal churches were "at one in doctrine, basis of church-membership, general superintendency, basis of ownership of church property," and as to "Scriptural holiness," adopted resolutions in favor of the union of the two bodies. The merging was accomplished at Chicago in October, 1907, and a manual was adopted. There was a further union, in October, 1908, at Pilot Point, Tex., with the Holiness Church of Christ, a Southern body composed of churches in various Southwestern States, some of which were

organized as early as 1888. At the time of union this organization had about 100 churches, the other having about 130.

The manual contains a statement of belief in eight items, assent to which is required as a basis of church-membership: the Trinity, the divinely inspired Bible, the fall of man, the eternal loss of the finally impenitent, the atonement of Christ, the entire sanctification of believers by faith subsequent to justification, the witness of the Spirit to justification and sanctification, the return of the Lord, and the resurrection and final Judgment. General rules, similar to those formulated by John Wesley, are set forth for the conduct of members. A chapter on special advices declares against the use of spirituous and fermented drinks and tobacco and membership in secret societies.

The polity provides for a general assembly and district assemblies. The general assembly elects general superintendents to hold office in the interim. They are to preside over the general assembly and over district assemblies, arrange the assembly districts, ordain elders, appoint evangelists and have general charge of the work of the Church. Licensed preachers, after having served as pastors, may be elected to elder's orders by district assemblies. Church boards arrange with ministers directly for the pastoral relation.

The Church has foreign missions in India, Japan, Cape Verde Islands, and Mexico, and home missions in various parts of the United States. It has a collegiate institute at North Scituate, R. I., doing preparatory work and giving theological training, the Deets Pacific Bible College at Los Angeles, Cal., for Bible-training, and a Bible Institute and Training-school, at Pilot Point, Tex. It recommends to the patronage of its people the Texas Holiness University, Peniel, Tex., and the Arkansas Holiness College, Vilonia, Ark. As official organs of the Church the *Nazarene Messenger*, Los Angeles, Cal., the *Beulah Christian*, Providence, R. I., and the *Holiness Evangel*, Pilot Point, Tex., are recognized. There were reported, at the close of 1908, 575 ministers, 230 churches, and 12,000 members. (*Schaff-Herzog Encycl.*, VIII, 453.)

It is this body from which soberer Methodists are moving away and endeavoring to induce other Methodists to disavow them. The writer in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* to whom we referred, "after a fair-minded and prolonged study" pronounces the Pentecostal movement "an unmix'd evil." He has found its devotees "emphatic, noisy, and obtrusive believers. One cannot be, it seems, a lukewarm member. You cease to be one of them when your temperature drops below the boiling point." Subsidence of the

"Spirit-power" is responsible for a considerable "turnover" that constantly takes place among the Pentecostal people, "backsliding being so prevalent that it requires large additions to membership to offset the loss. But at any given time the number of adherents is considerable. There are not so many as their noise indicates, but a great many of them nevertheless."

As regards the moral influence which they exert, "the writer has failed to find an instance of increased community morality because these people gained a foothold in any community. If anything is noticeable in this respect, it is that moral standards are lowered when they invade. They seem incapable of inculcating unselfishness. Most of the additions to their ranks are people who have been alienated from other Churches, being, in this, quite like the Russellites. Of a congregation of them in a near-by city [Mr. Montgomery writes from St. Clair, Mo.] it was learned that about sixty per cent. had been Methodists. They make much of this as evidence of the fact that Methodism has lost its revival warmth, and that these people have been starving for the spirituality offered by the Pentecostal Church. As a matter of fact, . . . they are more likely to be alienated from a Church having a great amount of what is commonly called Methodist revival warmth than from churches accused of being colder. It would make no difference to the Pentecostal Church how much of this revival fire it found in a Methodist (or other) church. Such church would not be immune from its insidious attacks any more than the Church reputed to be cold. The Pentecostal movement might be called high-voltage slander. He who has hoped to help them and work with them will be disillusioned by their treacherous attacks. Woe unto that unsuspecting preacher who tries to work with them in a revival meeting! When they are influential, it is only to widen the chasm between the churches and the groups who have cultivated their own pride by talking of the pride of the churches. In spite of this Ishmael-like disposition, they have been past masters in the art of posing as friendly and brotherly to all until they won the privilege of occupying a country chapel for a revival meeting. After the smoke and confusion passed away, he hunted in vain who would seek to find a Methodist church there. The larger number of their recruits are held for only a little while. But the effect upon them is usually to make them incurably hostile toward the Church. They afford a fine opportunity for curious onlookers to have confirmed their opinion that religion is nothing more than a joke."

With dismay the writer calls the attention of his Methodist brethren to "the fact that we are, in some considerable measure, responsible for the modern Pentecostal movement. It is never pleasant to make confession. It is never pleasant to recognize as our own that which we condemn in others. Hence the usual inability to see such. But there are some things in Methodism as strange to look upon as the naïve practise of the Baptists, who can, in the same breath, condemn the Roman Catholics for saying that no marriage is valid unless solemnized by a popish priest, and then declare that no baptism is true, Scriptural baptism unless administered by a Baptist and according to Baptist mode. Some of the things in which the modern Pentecostal movement specializes, things we deplore, were borrowed from the Methodists." The writer relates how he probed the quality of Pentecostal spirituality, the Pentecostal "capitalization of noise, jazz, and confusion" and was made to hang his head in shame when he heard people say of the Pentecostal doing, "Just like Methodism."

He advocates for the future that Methodism should be "intellectual, social, and dignified." By "intellectual" he understands not a "scholarly" religion, one that satisfies the brain while it leaves the heart cold, but one that presents "beliefs from which best intelligence need not dissent," what we ordinarily call rationalism of the subtile kind. By "social" he understands a religion that would teach "Trinitarians something of the great Christian faith that the Unitarian Arthur Nash has shown," that puts the Golden Rule into business, adores the great faith of the Quaker Seebohm Rowntree, recognizes humanity as a great brotherhood, and is eager to rally men to a fight against gambling and horse-racing rather than against evolution. "Dignified" is not to mean "dignimonious." "We are not thinking of stiffness and chill. But to think the great thoughts of religion, to be won by the great plan of Christianity, and to desire to act seemly in the presence of the God of love and might will surely argue for dignity of life, thought, and worship. The extemporaneous may be dignified. A reception for Charlie Chaplin would likely be more dignified than some of our religious (?) services. Jazz songs, flippant prayers, and uncouth sermons quite naturally introduce levity and disorder into our congregations and often give religion an appearance that is far removed from what we would naturally associate with the sublime. It is common to hear people berated because, while they are noisy at the ball game, they are so quiet and lacking in 'spontaneity' in the church. It is devoutly to be hoped that our people

will be, when in the church, unlike what they prefer to be when at the ball game. One referred to the church attendance of a certain religious group as 'paying their respects to the Almighty.' It was spoken rather scornfully. We have seen a great deal of religion, so called, that showed no respect for God. And the character of our people reveals the curse this has wrought."

Our writer, we fear, will not get very far on his triple basis of intellectuality, sociality, and dignity. If Methodism could be made to go back to the Aldersgate Street meeting and take up once more the study of Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans, then proceed to the study of Luther's Exposition of Galatians, then to Luther's *Wider die Schwaermer, Wider die Rottengeister* (XX, 762 ff. 1678 ff., etc.), — that would help. As to the Pentecostal movement, that is simply a part of the "great falling away" which was predicted before the return of the Lord. On the power of the Spirit in believers the Lutheran Church, and Luther above all, has expressed sound and sane Scriptural views that can serve as the antidote for many modern vagaries in which the Holy Spirit is presumed to be implicated.

Will the Fundamentalists Win Out in Their Fight Against the Modern Liberalists?

JOHN H. C. FRITZ, St. Louis, Mo.

The Fundamentalists are that party in the non-Lutheran Protestant churches of our day which is making a fight for the fundamentals of the Christian religion over against the Modern Liberalists, who deny these fundamental truths of the Bible and of historic Christianity. The Fundamentalists are sincere; this cannot be said of all the Modern Liberalists. The Fundamentalists are fighting for a good cause; the Modern Liberalists are not.

Will the Fundamentalists win out in their fight against the Modern Liberalists? Our conviction is that they will not, and cannot, unless they submit to a radical revision of their position by adopting an entirely different attitude toward the truth as it is revealed in the Scriptures and toward those who deny this truth.

In a recent issue (May 1, 1924) of the *Watchman-Examiner*, a Baptist weekly, a reply is printed to a friend, "a thoroughgoing evangelical," who wrote: "I like the *Watchman-Examiner*, but from the bottom of my heart I wish this controversy in our denomination might cease. Your paper is the key to the situation.

If you will stop adding fuel to the flames, the conflict will die down. Can we not have at Milwaukee an old-fashioned, non-controversial convention?"

To this request the *Watchman-Examiner* made the following reply in an editorial: "We take no offense at such a letter as the foregoing, but we confess that it cuts us to the quick. We dislike controversy and conflict. We despise littleness, meanness, and bitterness of spirit. But in the name of the living God we ask if we ought to give up the defense of the truth merely that we may all be at ease in Zion. As far as we can see, the signs of the times do not point to peace. No one man, no thousand men among us, can stop this controversy. *There is an irrepressible and eternal conflict between truth and error.* We hope sincerely that the time has arrived when the controversy can be lifted above pettiness, meanness, and bitterness. The question that will not down is this, *Are the great doctrines written into the confessions of faith of all denominations the doctrines of God's Word?* The *Watchman-Examiner* believes that the historic faith of our churches is the faith of the New Testament. As we see it, there is not the shadow of a doubt about this. *But this New Testament faith is being attacked and ridiculed. A professor in one of our own theological seminaries has said that this faith as interpreted by Paul is fit only for African savages.* Under these circumstances, what must be the attitude of those who cling to this New Testament faith and count it their most precious possession? Under existing circumstances, dare they be silent? Can they be silent? *Would not silence be cowardice and treachery?* Better that a man be silent when the honor of his mother or his wife is publicly assailed. The *Watchman-Examiner* resents the imputation that it has been a stirrer up of strife, but it glories in being a defender of the faith. It is loyal to our denomination and has done its utmost to advance the interests of our organized work: *but the New Testament faith is dearer to us than all the organizations on earth put together.* To the defense and promotion of that faith the *Watchman-Examiner* here and now dedicates itself afresh." [The italics throughout are our own.]

This makes good reading. It breathes the spirit of sincerity. The main question in the whole controversy is well put: "Are the great doctrines written into the confessions of faith of all denominations the doctrines of God's Word?" That is the question which calls for an answer. When the answer has been given, corresponding action is demanded. The answer to the question cannot be

given without calling forth a controversy. The Fundamentalists have such in their camps as radically disagree with them. "A professor in one of our own theological seminaries," says the *Watchman-Examiner*, "has said that this faith as interpreted by Paul is fit only for African savages." That professor is not the only one among the Baptists and other denominations who ridicule the religion of Paul and deny the religion of Jesus Christ. There are many others: professors, pastors, laymen. This is well known; it is also frankly admitted.

What shall be done? Shall the controversy go on? The *Watchman-Examiner* says that silence would be "cowardice and treachery." But how shall the controversy go on? Shall it be made the chief issue of the Church and fought to a finish, and shall this be done as speedily as possible? Although the very fundamental truths of the Christian religion are at stake, the editorial in the *Watchman-Examiner* from which we are quoting says: "*We sincerely hope that we may have at Milwaukee 'a non-controversial' convention. To give this irrepressible doctrinal conflict of which we have been speaking the center of the stage at Milwaukee would be most unfortunate. From the first we have pleaded that this controversy should be irenic and academic, and that it should not involve organization questions. It can be readily seen, however, that such a course was impossible, because, in the nature of the case, you cannot long keep doctrinal and organization questions apart. On the other hand, neither the Northern Convention nor the general missionary societies were organized to pass on doctrinal questions or to establish a doctrinal standard. The convention and the societies are the creatures of the churches, and they were organized to do a definite work. That work was not to adopt a creed that can be so construed as to have binding authority.*" [Italics throughout our own.]

Strange, is it not? The same editorial which tells us that the "doctrines of God's Word" are being assailed, and that it would be "cowardice and treachery" to keep silent, at the same time advocates a *non-controversial* convention of its church-body, going even so far as to say that it would be "most unfortunate" to give the "irrepressible doctrinal conflict *the center of the stage.*" Church organizations, we are told, have not been called into being for the purpose of carrying on controversies, nor "to adopt a creed that can be so construed as to have binding authority." This reminds us of the Presbyterian clergyman who a number of years ago, in our study, expressed himself something like this: "I do

not demand that every one who joins my church subscribe to the Westminster Confession, nor do I demand that he believe as I do."

We ask, If a controversy which involves the very life or death of a church organization is not to be given the center of the stage, what is? If a church organization, claiming to be Christian and claiming to accept the Scriptures as God's inerrant Word, will not, over against false teachers and antichristian religious organizations, adopt a creed of binding authority *which shows what it believes*, we ask, what, then, does such a church organization stand for *doctrinally*? Is such a church organization actually in a position to fight error? Can it have the courage to do so? Can it uncompromisingly defend the truth?

The Bible tells us not to compromise between truth and error. When the Galatians had forsaken the Gospel, Paul did not seek to compromise with them, but he wrote: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not another; but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, 6—8. This is plain language. Truth and error will not mix, and one who tries to mix them will simply yield the truth in favor of error.

The spirit of indifferentism and compromise has been characteristic of the Reformed theology since its very earliest history. *It is, in fact, an essential part of its system.* If it were to eliminate it from its system, it would cease to be what it is. Reformed theologians to this very day cannot understand why Luther accused Zwingli and his followers at Marburg in the year 1529 of having a different spirit ("*Ihr habt einen andern Geist*"). They will even now not forgive Luther for having refused to Zwingli the hand of fellowship. They cannot understand why our Lutheran church-body stands for doctrinal purity and therefore refuses to have pulpit- and altar-fellowship with such as disagree with it in doctrine. Such a position, they tell us, is narrow, — if they are at all willing to dismiss the case with such a mild reprimand. Such plain words in Scripture as, "Hold fast the form of sound words," 2 Tim. 1, 13; "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them," Rom. 16, 17; "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1, 8; "Beware of false prophets,"

Matt. 7, 15; and many other, similar plain words and commands of Scripture, are by them not at all understood.

That very spirit of Zwingli of which Luther spoke was a compromising spirit, a spirit which would not make a clean-cut and clear-cut issue of the truth, a spirit which would let truth and error stand side by side in the Church. What the result of that position has been is clearly seen in the deplorable condition of the non-Lutheran denominations of our day. The course which the admission of error into the Church takes can work out only in one way. In his *Conservative Reformation* Dr. Krauth says: "When error is admitted into the Church, it will be found that the stages of its progress are always three. It begins by asking *toleration*. Its friends say to the majority: You need not be afraid of us; we are few and weak; only let us alone; we shall not disturb the faith of others. The Church has her standards of doctrine; of course, we shall never interfere with them; we only ask for ourselves to be spared interference with our private opinions. Indulged in this for a time, error goes on to assert *equal rights*. Truth and error are two balancing forces. The Church shall do nothing which looks like deciding between them; that would be partiality. It is bigotry to assert any superior right for the truth. We are to agree to differ, and any favoring of the truth because it is truth is partisanship. What the friends of truth and error hold in common is fundamental. Anything on which they differ is *ipso facto* non-essential. Anybody who makes account of such a thing is a disturber of the peace of the Church. Truth and error are two coordinate powers, and the great secret of church-statesmanship is to preserve the balance between them. From this point error soon goes on to its natural end, which is to assert *supremacy*. Truth started with *tolerating*; it comes to be merely tolerated, and that only for a time. Error claims a preference for its judgments on all disputed points. It puts men into positions, not as at first in spite of their departure from the Church's faith, but in consequence of it. Their recommendation is that they repudiate that faith, and position is given them to teach others to repudiate it, and to make them skilful in combating it."

How shall we account for the peculiar position held toward the truth by the theologians of the Reformed Church, to which also the Fundamentalists of our day belong? Their peculiar position toward the truth, and consequently also toward those who deny the truth, is due to their peculiar position held toward the Scriptures. In the first place, they are not agreed that the Bible

is the *verbally* inspired Word of God; in the second place, none of them accepts the divine principle of Bible interpretation: *Scriptura Scripturam interpretatur*, nor that other hermeneutical principle, which is closely related to it: *Sensus literalis unus est*; on the contrary, *they let man assume the right to interpret the Scripture as he understands it*. This wrong principle of Scripture interpretation has opened the floodgates to the various and manifold differing opinions in the Church and to the spirit of sectarianism. This wrong attitude toward the Scriptures is the weakness of non-Lutheran Protestantism and the very thing which in the course of time, in the very measure in which the wrong principle is being *consistently* applied, is bringing about its ruin.

The fact is that in their attitude toward the Scriptures the Fundamentalists and the Modern Liberalists do not essentially differ; *they differ only in degree*. Both the Fundamentalists and the Modern Liberalists accord to human reason the right to interpret what God says in the Bible; the only difference is that the Modern Liberalists have consistently carried out the principle and have therefore also applied it to such doctrines as the deity of Christ and the atonement, while the Fundamentalists have not yet gone to the same extent, in other words, are yet more or less inconsistent.

To the Fundamentalists this criticism, we know, will seem harsh. But we ask, Is it not true? The fact of the existence of the denominations, differing as they do in doctrine, can be explained only on the basis of a wrong principle of Scripture interpretation. If all men in the Church would admit that the Bible must be taken as it reads, taken at its face value, then there could be no differences of opinion as to doctrine; and without differences as to doctrine there could be no denominationalism in the Christian Church. The grievance which Zwingli had against Luther was that Luther clung too closely to the letter of the Scriptures, and it is this same grievance which the churches of the Reformed theology have against our Lutheran Church to-day. It is our intolerant spirit over against any departure from the *one* true meaning which the words of the Scripture convey that they detest. If we would grant to every man, as they do, the right of his own private opinion in interpreting the Scriptures, then they would not accuse us of narrowness and bigotry. If we, however, would take their position, we would be just as unable and as ineffectual as they are to combat error and, in the same way as they are doing,

expose ourselves to the same dangers and put ourselves under the same condemnation.

For the sake of avoiding misunderstanding, it may be well to add here the distinction which must be made between the *assumed right* of private interpretation and the *divine right* of private judgment. Man has the right of private judgment, that is, the right that he himself may go directly to the Scripture to find out *what Scripture teaches*. Man need not, and ought not, take his theology from any human authority, as the Pope, the church councils, the pronouncements of any church-body or synod, but every man should make sure that what he believes is taken from the Bible. For this purpose every man must have access to the Bible itself, must read and study it, and on the basis of his own investigation be able to say, "Thus saith the Lord." But no man has the right, after he has learned to know what the Lord has said, to put his own private interpretation upon the Lord's words. After man has learned what the Lord has clearly revealed in His Word, there is but one thing left for him to do, if he would be a Christian who does the Lord's will, namely, *to accept what the Lord says*.

The Fundamentalists, we contend, do not approach the Modern Liberalists with clean hands. It seems to us that they realize this, perhaps unconsciously so. Because they are not willing to take the first step, that is, to believe that the Bible is the *verbally* inspired Word of God, that it must be taken as it reads, and that no man has the right to read into the words of the Bible his own opinions, therefore they are not willing to take the second step, in fact, they cannot consistently do so, namely, deny others the right which they for themselves have assumed; nor can they consistently take the third step, that is, separate themselves from those who teach error. Yet it is this very thing which the Word of God teaches us to do, namely, to separate ourselves from religious errorists, especially from those who, as far as they are concerned, undermine the whole structure of the Christian Church. Any one who reads the sign, "Beware of the dog!" on any gate which leads to a yard, readily understands what it means. It is plain English. So it is plain English when the Lord says, "Beware of false prophets!" In fact, the Lord Himself has posted the sign, "Beware of dogs!" in His Word and thereby does not refer to the canine kind, but to the human kind, the "evil workers," the false teachers. Phil. 3, 2. Paul's words to the Romans also are plain. He says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and

offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, *and avoid them*. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Rom. 16, 17, 18. Equally plain are the words of Paul to the Galatians: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, 6—9. Nor can there be any doubt as to what Paul means when he writes to the Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. 6, 4—18. But why multiply texts? The words are plain. Their intention can easily be understood; we need but heed them.

Are the Fundamentalists doing what the Lord says? Are they separating themselves from those who are denying the fundamentals of Christianity? No; they are not. We do not even have any evidence of their serious intentions of doing so. We know that occasionally the resignation of a false teacher is demanded, but this happens very seldom. The fact is that such denominations as the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and others have many Liberalists in their theological schools, in their pulpits, and also in their pews, have had them for many years, have been tolerating them, are tolerating them to-day, and are giving no indication of any willingness to change their position in this respect. After all, they are not willing to give to the doctrinal conflict "*the center of the stage*" and then fight the fight to a finish. They tell us that the controversy—this great con-

troversy in the life-and-death struggle of the Church — should be “irenic and academic.” What do they mean? In the light of what has happened and what is happening to-day we can understand “irenic” to mean only this, that the controversy should be so carried on that in spite of it “the peace of the Church” be not seriously disturbed; and “academic” we can understand only to mean that the controversy should continue to be formal and theoretical, rather than to have it fought through to such practical results as would demand, and insist upon, that the prophets of the Lord separate themselves from the prophets of Baal.

As long as the Fundamentalists do not change their old position in their attitude toward the Bible and toward errorists, they cannot win out. Worse than that; in the course of time they themselves will become more and more contaminated with the poison of false doctrine and with the spirit of indifferentism. Sad, but true.

We do believe and hope, however, that now and then some of the Fundamentalists, and occasionally even a Liberalist, will be completely won over to the cause of the truth and will separate himself from those who deny it. May the Lord strengthen those who are fighting His battles; for, verily, none of us can stand alone. But victory can be won only by the power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and not by the wisdom of men, that “our faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.” 1 Cor. 2, 5.

The Difference.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

The frank and bold testimony of the Fundamentalists, their courageous stand against liberalism, and their sincere devotion to the Scriptures have deservedly secured for them cordial sympathy and approval also within the Lutheran Church. This applies in particular to certain church periodicals which have fought for the truth with vigor and zeal, stressing with great distinctness the fundamental doctrines of evangelical Christendom, to which all believing Christians must adhere. So much of what the *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist), the *Presbyterian*, the *Sunday-school Times*, and other kindred papers have published on the deity of Christ, the vicarious atonement, the inspiration of the Bible, the power of the Word of God, etc., was so altogether sound and Scriptural that the Christian reader was moved to praise God

for their excellent testimony to the truth. Indeed, the wearisome controversy has not been without fruits. It has led many to a deeper appreciation of those basic verities upon which the Church of Christ is built.

Nevertheless, after all has been said, there remains a sharp difference between Calvinistic Fundamentalism and confessional Lutheranism, — a difference not in degree, but in kind. This difference must not be overlooked. Honesty compels one to call attention to it. Indeed, the very desire of aiding the Fundamentalists in their struggle makes it necessary. For truth will be victorious only if it is accepted, confessed, and preached in its full glory and absolute purity. The one paramount blessing which we, as true friends, wish the Fundamentalists is the clear visualizing of divine truth, the unqualified acceptance of God's Word, and the absolute rejection of all erroneous doctrines which erring reason may suggest. May the light come to them as it came to Martin Luther when he fought liberalism in the papacy, and may they, as did he, center all they believe and teach in the great doctrines of *sola gratia, sola fide, sola Scriptura*. It is then only that the difference between Calvinistic Fundamentalism and confessional Lutheranism will be eliminated.

This thought was suggested to the writer by an editorial which appeared in the *Watchman-Examiner* (May, 1924) under the caption "Truth Is Immortal," the slogan of Balthasar Huebmaier. The editorial reads:—

"Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli, and Balthasar Huebmaier were contemporaries, born within three or four years of each other — 1483, 1484, and 1480. They were all men of great ability, of varied learning, of highly popular gifts, the last-named being fully the equal of the others in these respects. They were leaders in the Reformed Christianity. Huebmaier, who is probably wholly unknown to the general reader, worked his way clearly out to the Baptist position as it is set forth in the New Testament — faith and repentance, baptism, the spiritual life, individual responsibility, freedom of conscience, no connection between Church and State, the New Testament as the only authority in religious affairs. There were moments when it seemed that Zwingli and Luther were prepared to go as far as Huebmaier, moments of clear spiritual vision. But they hesitated. They feared to cut loose from dependence on the power of the magistrate and his soldiers in times of disorder. They feared to commit themselves to New Testament voluntary church-membership and a spiritual democ-

racy. Luther and Zwingli prospered through their political friendship, while Huebmaier was taken by the political powers and burned at the stake. . . . The world still needs instruction in the things for which Baptists have stood."

This editorial was penned by a staunch Fundamentalist, a man who stands foremost in the ranks of those who endeavor to defend evangelical truth. It is therefore representative of the attitude of Fundamentalists toward the great Reformer and clearly marks the difference of which we have spoken before. We do not mean the failure of seeing events and persons in their true light, the mingling of fact and fiction, the bias, the intense party feeling, which are glaringly apparent in almost every line. We deeply regret all these faults. We deeply regret also the unionistic spirit that pervades the article, and the misrepresentation of facts in ascribing to Luther a cowardly spirit, which would rather deny the truth than "cut loose from dependence on the power of the magistrate and his soldiers in times of disorder." With all these misrepresentations the Lutheran student of history may rightly find fault; for they are simply not true. However, the difference which we have in mind is more subtle. The writer has failed, first and above all, to comprehend the basic principle of the Reformation. To him the Reformation is a sealed book. He has not learned its paramount lesson. He is as far removed from understanding the real issue involved in the Reformation as the Liberalists are removed from the right understanding of the truths involved in their present controversy with the Fundamentalists. To him Luther, Zwingli, and Huebmaier are alike great leaders in Reformed Christianity, "the last-named being fully the equal of the others in these respects." So he did not see that there was a tremendous difference between Luther and the Anabaptist Huebmaier, — a difference which still exists between confessional Lutherans and Fundamentalist Baptists.

Since Balthasar Huebmaier is virtually unknown to the general reader, it will be necessary to sketch at least the main events in his rather brief life. He was born in 1480 at Friedberg, near the prominent city of Augsburg, in Bavaria, and early in his life received that education which was accorded to those who desired to enter the priesthood. Later he studied theology and philosophy at Freiburg with Eck, the notorious opponent of Luther and past grand master in the art of juggling words. From him Huebmaier no doubt acquired the love for disputation and debate which characterized him throughout his later life. In 1512, at the time

when Luther had already returned from Rome with the divine assurance of the Gospel "that the just shall live by faith" ringing in his ears, Huebmaier went with his instructor to Ingolstadt, where he, already prominent in eloquence and in the knack of influencing the masses, became preacher and professor. His work at Ingolstadt was accompanied with great success; and so, four years later, he was called to Regensburg as preacher at the Cathedral. With Eck he remained on terms of intimate friendship, although the controversies of Luther seemed to have made no lasting impression on him. In his works he rarely mentions Luther and the paramount movement which shook the pillars of the Church. However, already at this early time the fanatical tendencies of Huebmaier were revealed in his persecution of the Jews. Owing to his agitation the Jews were expelled from the city by force. Perhaps the consequences of this act led him to a deeper study of the Reformation movement. So much seems to be clear at least, that already at Regensburg he began to doubt that the Catholic Church is the true Church. In 1521 Huebmaier received a call to Waldshut, in Lower Austria, where after a while he embraced the views of the Swiss Reformed theologians. Two years later he visited Zurich and St. Gall, entering into closer communication with Zwingli. In 1524 he published his *Schlussreden*, which were directed against the Romish mass, image-worship, fasting, pilgrimages, purgatory, and celibacy. In the same year Waldshut embraced the evangelical faith and agreed to defend Huebmaier, whose actions had aroused the intense hostility of the government of Lower Austria. For a while Huebmaier sought refuge at Schaffhausen, but he soon returned and directed the religious and political policy of the city.

About this time Huebmaier deserted the cause of Zwingli and adopted Anabaptist doctrines. Soon Waldshut was the center of religious, social, and political ferment. Huebmaier himself fell under the influence of Thomas Muenzer, and he became convinced that the only way in which a thorough reformation could be made would be by the radical methods suggested by Muenzer. In 1525 he was baptized by the Anabaptist Reublin, and in the controversy with Zwingli, which soon broke out, he published two works, which appeared in 1526: *Von dem christlichen Tauf der Glaebigen* and *Ein Gespraech von dem Kindertauf*, in which he set forth his Anabaptist views on infant baptism. His bold preaching of Anabaptist doctrines involved him in difficulties with Zwingli, and when, in 1525, Waldshut was taken by Austrian forces and the

Roman Catholic religion was reintroduced, Huebmaier, having fled to Zurich, was imprisoned, and fearing he would be delivered to the Austrian authorities, he consented, under torture, to abjure his views. However, as soon as he had left Zurich and had found refuge at Constance, he repudiated this act as having been done under compulsion, which moved Zwingli to characterize him as a man actuated solely by a desire for notoriety and gain. Zwingli has been criticised severely on account of his participation in the torturing of Huebmaier, and his remarks have been reproved as altogether out of place and cynical. Nevertheless, no one will deny that there is more than a grain of truth in Zwingli's characterization of Huebmaier "as a man actuated solely by a desire for notoriety and gain." In 1526 Huebmaier, having for all time repudiated his Zwinglian connections, came to Nicolsburg in Moravia, where, under the protection of Martin Goeschl, he transformed the incipient Lutheran congregation into an Anabaptist community. He converted to Anabaptism the three ministers Oswald Glait, Hans Spittelmayer, and even the noble and learned von Lichtenstein, so that, in consequence of his astounding success, his fame spread through Switzerland and Germany, and Anabaptists flocked from all directions to the Moravian stronghold of Anabaptist communism. At Nicolsburg Huebmaier continued to publish tracts against the Swiss reformers, emphasizing his views on Baptism, the Lord's Supper, communal discipline, and the relation of Christians to established authority. In consequence of his ardent preaching and his extensive writing the Anabaptist movement spread rapidly into Tyrol, Salzburg, and the two Austrias. However, this very success aroused the ire of the Roman Catholic authorities, and in 1527 Huebmaier's surrender was demanded and granted. Taken to Vienna, the wavering, fickle, inconstant character of the man again revealed itself. Within four years, from 1523 to 1527, Huebmaier had changed his religious views four times. He had abjured Catholicism and embraced Zwinglianism; leaving Zwinglianism, he had adopted Anabaptism; under torture he had rejected Anabaptism and accepted Zwinglianism; and lastly he had once more left Zwinglianism and returned to Anabaptism. Now, when torture threatened again, he sued for peace with the Roman Catholic Church, promising broad concessions in opposition to Luther and Zwingli, refusing, however, to yield on the questions of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In consequence of this refusal he was publicly burned at the stake on March 10, 1528, meeting death apparently boldly and calmly.

His wife was imprisoned with him and put to death a little later by drowning. Such, in brief, is the biographical sketch of Balthasar Huebmaier, the apostle of Anabaptism, the greatest champion of their views, and the only learned scholar in this radical sect.

That the views on Huebmaier's life and work should differ widely from one another is natural. Luther's view is well known. He writes of him briefly: "I know very well, my dear sirs, that Balthasar Huebmohr has expressly and by name referred to me in his blasphemous pamphlet on Anabaptism, as if I, too, were of his foolish mind" ("Ich weiss leider fast wohl, meine lieben Herren, dass der Balthasar Huebmohr mich auch unter andern mit Namen einfuehret in seinem laesterlichen Buechlein von der Wiedertaufe, als sollt' ich auch seines toerichten Sinnes sein"). Baptist historians, as a rule, value him too highly, as the editorial quoted above shows. Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary, in his biography *Balthasar Huebmaier, the Leader of the Anabaptists*, which is one of the volumes of that fine series "Heroes of the Reformation," is reasonably fair in judging both his character and his work. Of his character he remarks: "The praise of unswerving constancy to the truth cannot be awarded him. Huebmaier's conduct in these closing months of his life is far from heroic." (p. 236.) The *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* records: "His place is undeniably in the front rank of German Anabaptists. . . . He represents the simple, conservative Anabaptist doctrine, which grounded itself on the Scriptures"; *s. v.* Huebmaier. McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia* states: "Huebmayer is now conceded by all historians to have been a man of very exalted character, and although a fanatic in religion, it is certain that he never favored the extreme views of some of the Anabaptists."

We are at present concerned with the fundamental difference that may be pointed out in the life and views of Huebmaier and Luther. That such a difference exists cannot be denied. It exists with regard to the lives of these two men. Luther's life was like a huge river, flowing calmly from source to mouth, while Huebmaier's life was like a turbulent mountain stream. Luther's development was slow, constant, and progressive, while Huebmaier's was rapid, abrupt, unsteady. Luther coveted martyrdom, while Huebmaier shrank from torture. Luther remained a conservative, retaining a sane and sober outlook on life, while Huebmaier, after severing his relations with the Roman Catholic Church, drifted aimlessly and helplessly. Luther's teachings were intensely prac-

tical, the means to the greater end of bringing back to the Bible the common people, while Huebmaier's love for disputation for disputation's sake is manifest even in his popular works. Luther retained throughout his life his wonderful share of common sense, while Huebmaier under the stress of trials and attacks showed himself impulsive, rash, erratic. Luther was great in all he did, while Huebmaier succumbed to pettishness. Luther was the great Reformer; Huebmaier, though personally noble and honorable, went down with the stream of radicals who followed in the wake of the Reformation.

The *reason* for all this is clear. Luther's spiritual and doctrinal development came forth from a struggle, deep and painful. Through the Gospel the Holy Spirit Himself had solved Luther's great problem of how to obtain forgiveness of sins. That problem solved, Luther directed his entire work of showing others how they also might solve this paramount problem. He preached the *sola Scriptura* because neither human counsel nor reason could determine the salvation of man. He preached the *sola gratia* because he knew from experience that works could not save. He preached the *universalis gratia* because he, the greatest of sinners, had been accepted and sanctified. He flouted reason because in the papacy damnable reason had damned millions of souls. Whatever Luther did was accomplished in connection with the vast lesson he had learned when he was rescued from the abysmal pit of doubt and despair.

Huebmaier had not passed through such a struggle. His interest in the truth of Scripture was theoretical and speculative rather than practical. This explains why he was willing to sue for peace with the Roman Catholic Church and make broad concessions, abjuring a large number of views which he had previously taught with great vigor. On the other hand, those very views to which he adhered even under peril of death were manifestly held on grounds of rationalistic consideration. They came from a critical head and mind rather than from a sincere heart imbued with faith so pure and strong as to reject all doctrines at variance with the Word of God. Here is the point where Huebmaier failed. He never overcame Romanistic Semi-Pelagianism and Zwinglian rationalism, because, unlike Luther, he would not bend reason to revelation. Lastly, Huebmaier never attained to that clearness of doctrine which must be expected from a public teacher of the Gospel. Being essentially rationalistic, his religious views remained blurred, and the theses which he at various times sought

to defend fell short of the whole truth. These, we believe, are the predominant faults of Huebmaier's theology.

A few examples might be given by way of illustration. In a series of theses drawn up at Waldshut in June, 1525, he says:—

"Faith alone makes us just before God. This faith is the *knowledge* of the mercy of God which He manifested to us through the giving of His only-begotten Son. Thereby are overthrown all sham Christians, who have only 'a historical faith' in God." In 1528, while imprisoned, in his formal statement of his beliefs (*Rechenschaft*) concerning faith he said: "Faith alone is not enough for salvation. . . . Since mere faith does not suffice for salvation, good works must also be added to it. Whoso permits his faith to stand by itself and does not prove it by good works changes Christian liberty into liberty of the flesh." This condemns Luther's doctrine and champions the Roman Catholic teaching.

Concerning *free will* he writes in the same connection: "He who denies the free will of men and calls it an empty claim (Luther) is nothing in himself, nicknames God a tyrant, charges Him with injustice, and gives the wicked excuse to remain in their sins." (This is more than Romanistic Semi-Pelagianism).

Concerning the *Gospel*, Huebmaier declares: "To avoid evil works and repent of our sins is the doctrine of the whole Gospel." (Huebmaier here intermingles Law and Gospel.)

Concerning the *Church* he says: "The Church is an *external assembling* and community of believers in one Lord, one faith, and one Baptism." (This is practically the Roman Catholic definition.)

Concerning the *intercessions of the saints* he states: "The intercessions of the saints in our behalf are not in vain." (Roman Catholic.)

Concerning *Baptism* he argues: "Water baptism . . . is an external and public testimony of the inward baptism of the Spirit, set forth by receiving water. By this not only are sins confessed, but also faith in their pardon, by the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, is declared before all men. Hereby also the recipient is externally marked, inscribed, and incorporated into the fellowship of the churches, according to the ordinance of Christ." (A blend of Zwinglianism and Muenzerism.)

In accord with this lack of clearness and definiteness, on the one hand, and the failure of teaching Scriptural doctrines without perversions, on the other, stands the fact that Huebmaier neither understood nor valued the central, basic teaching of Scripture concerning justification by faith. Professor Vedder rightly remarks in his biography: "There is no [express] mention of justification in Huebmaier's writings, even where we might fairly expect to find it, in his catechism, and of course no distinction between *justification* and *sanctification*. This omission cannot be explained like many others; the importance that these doctrines assumed in the Reformation period, and the amount of attention given them by all writers, preclude any explanation, on grounds of lack of necessity, inadvertence, and the like, for their absence from the carefully elaborated and deliberately printed works of any man of the time. The omission must be deliberate, calculated, wilful. An omission of such character can be accounted for only on one ground, that Huebmaier was anxious to mark clearly his divergence from Luther in some matters that the latter reckoned cardinal in the Protestant theology." Professor Vedder adds to this: "Beyond this we are utterly in the dark." This darkness disappears when we consider that a theologian who holds that salvation is not by faith alone, but also by works, and that man has retained a free and uncorrupted will even after the Fall, cannot teach the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ. If salvation is partly by works, the distinction between justification and sanctification must of necessity fall.

With that Huebmaier's theology falls. It was after all, in its essential features, only a slight modification of Roman Catholic Semi-Pelagianism, blended with Zwinglianism and Anabaptism, and the whole man-raised structure was built upon crass rationalism. Neither the *sola Scriptura* nor the *sola gratia* was understood by Huebmaier and his followers. It was for this reason that it failed, and not "because Huebmaier was taken by the political powers and burned at the stake." It had not in itself the stamina of growth and victory. It perished as soon as the man who sponsored it perished. On the other hand, Luther's Gospel succeeded, not because it "prospered through political friendship," but because it is the truth divine, which is immortal. Not to his own theology, but to the theology of the Bible which Luther proclaimed to the world may the words of Huebmaier be applied which he penned in *Die ander Erbietung* (Schaffhausen, 1524): "Die goettliche Warheit ist untoedlich, und wiewohl sy sich ettwan lang fahen

"lasst, geyslen, kroenen, creuetzigen und in das Grab legen, wuerdet sy doch am dritten Tag wiederumb sygreich uferston und im ewigkeit regieren und triumphieren." *

Only as the Scriptural doctrines concerning universal grace and justification by grace through faith in Christ alone will be understood by the present-day Fundamentalists, will they be able to comprehend the real issue involved in Luther's battles in the days of the Reformation. And only then will they themselves be benefited in their own fight for the truth. To discredit Luther, to place on his high level other would-be Reformers, to ascribe to erring Huebmaier a spiritual vision which Luther had, but from which he shrank because it implied the surrender of the protection of magistrates in whom he trusted, means not only to misrepresent facts, but to toll their own death-knell in the warfare which is now on. *Quo propior Luthero, eo melior theologus*, is a maxim which applies also to modern Fundamentalists. A little more careful study of Luther's doctrines and methods would soon convince them that Luther's victory did not depend on any magistrate, but upon the invincible Word, of which he said: "It is such a rock and firm foundation that the hellish gates cannot prevail against it. Where it remains and is preached, there at last even some of its enemies will be converted, who have proved themselves hounds of Satan." (St. L. Ed., V, 1277.) Then, too, they would find that Luther at no time of his life was prepared to go as far as did Huebmaier in radicalism and extravagance. Lastly, they would find that the great difference between the two was the difference existing between those who teach God's Word and those who deny it and put in its stead the dictates of reason.

Truth is immortal; it will stand and conquer. However, that truth is a fixed, determined, certain Word, which God has given us in the Bible and from which we dare not depart. The world to-day does not need instruction "in the things for which Baptists stood," but rather instruction in the inspired doctrines for which Christ has stood. As we teach His sayings, we shall stand; otherwise not. Only Christ's revealed truth is immortal, and it immortalizes all those who believe and teach it in its truth and purity.

* Divine truth is immortal, and though it be taken captive, scourged, crowned, crucified, and placed in the sepulcher, it will nevertheless rise victoriously on the third day and rule and triumph to all eternity.

Early Catholic Missionary Efforts in America.

FRED KROENCKE, Cincinnati, O.

1. Spanish Catholicism in America.

Elements of Weakness. — The union of Church and State was a boon neither to the Old nor to the New World. The Church, as the dominant power in the union, only too often employed the State as a means of grace, "the big stick," in order thereby to convert the peoples of the Americas into submissive subjects, into slaves or into corpses. Consequently, as a loyal son of the Church, the Catholic king of Spain, King Ferdinand, in his *Requirimiento*, ordered the conversion of the natives in America and therefore demanded that the leaders of expeditions require the people of an invaded province to submit to the Catholic faith, to the Pope, and to the king of Spain under threat of war and of death or under pain of slavery and confiscation of their property.

Commensurate with this evil, conversion by force was the method whereby the Church or the cause of missions was supported. The Church was subsidized; it either secured liberal subventions from the Spanish treasury, or its cost of establishment and maintenance was a charge against the funds of an expedition, that is, also against the spoils resulting from an invasion. In fact either arrangement under this system invited spoliation of an invaded province on the part of the civil rulers and connivance on the part of the Church. Under the circumstances it was natural for the Church to collapse when, upon the cession of the territory to some other power, it was thrown upon its own resources.

Finally, gold was the magnet that drew the Spanish "Christian" to America, greed the spirit that animated him in the invasion and settlement of a colony. Hence Spanish Christianity, if Christianity it can be called, proceeded most ruthlessly in its occupation of the Americas, particularly of the West Indies and of Mexico; it exemplified not the principles of Christ, but those of Mohammed. It is said, though it seems to be an exaggeration, that not less than fifteen million natives were put to death. At all events, large numbers perished. And only one voice, that of Las Casas, a Dominican friar, was raised in emphatic protest against the butchery and inhuman treatment of the Indian; only he besought the Spanish crown for a mitigation of the cruel policy of this ecclesiastico-military rule in America.

The Effort in Florida. — Spain's effort to plant the cross and the Castilian banner on the soil of Florida does not earn our unstinted praise. Pedro Menendez came with soldiers and colonists as well as with the necessary regular priests as chaplains and monks as missionaries. True to Spanish tradition he laid the foundations of St. Augustine in blood. Menendez celebrated his safe arrival by proceeding at once against the French Huguenots located at the mouth of the St. Johns River. He reduced their fort, Fort Caroline, and exterminated the colonists nearly to the last man along with Ribault, their leader, although he had promised to spare the lives of those who with Ribault had first escaped him. Amid such treachery and cruelty, St. Augustine was founded in 1565. It is quite in keeping with this spirit to discover that the fort at this place was erected by the toil of the first negro slaves to be found on territory which later was included in the United States.

In time a cathedral was erected, and Catholic institutions were established. Moreover, while the secular clergy attended to the spiritual needs of the Spanish garrisons and settlements at St. Augustine, at Cape Canaveral, and at Port Royal, the friars, first Dominicans, then Jesuits, and at last Franciscans, centered their activity upon the conversion of the Indians. After forty years of labor among the natives twenty-five to thirty thousand converts were reported under the supervision of thirty-five Franciscan missionaries at forty-four stations. Nevertheless, when in 1763 Florida was ceded to the British crown, Spanish Christianity, though it had operated in these parts for two centuries, at once collapsed. It could not operate as formerly without its subsidies from the Spanish treasury. Moreover, in place of peaceful pursuits, such as the erection of schools and the education and indoctrination of the colonists and Indians, bloody warfare, several expeditions against the settlements in the Carolinas, one of which resulted in the destruction of the colony of Scotch Presbyterians at Port Royal (1680), rather signalized the latter period of Spanish occupation.

The Church in New Mexico. — History records a similar story of New Mexico, its colonization, propagation of the faith, and failure of Spanish Catholicism in this province. Santa Fe was founded in 1606 by a splendidly equipped and strong expedition, including merchant, mechanic, farmer, and, above all, soldier and friar under the leadership of Juande Onate; or rather, this body of men took possession of a pueblo town of fifteen thousand inhabitants. The Spanish type of missionary zeal was exemplified

by the reduction of several other pueblo towns, by their enforced conversion to Catholic faith and the Spanish crown. The Franciscan friars, we are told, made converts at a marvelous rate. Reinforcements of both friars and soldiers were necessary to garner the harvest. No less than eight thousand are said to have been baptized during the first ten years by the methods of the friars in the shadow of the military. Indeed, the entire population of the province, colonist and native alike, was considered as delighting in the ministrations of some sixty friars.

Why, then, after eighty years of Spanish Gospel dispensation in New Mexico, a revolt by the Indians, which exterminated civil ruler as well as spiritual father, every Spaniard north of El Paso? The gospel of force had been only too well inculcated during the period of occupation by the nominal benefactor. Above all things, the Indian did not fail to efface every trace of the gold-mines which had been opened by the Spaniards. It was rather greed for gold than zeal for souls that brought the Spanish Catholic into this El Dorado.

Though later the missionary returned under armed protection, he could not secure for himself more than a sullen toleration and for his religion an indifferent observance of Catholic ceremony. It is but natural that after two centuries of work in New Mexico the Bishop of Durango, in 1845, found only twenty out of eighty thousand Indians within the pale of the Church. Since 1848, when the province became a part of the United States, little more than the Church of San Miguel and the Cathedral of San Francisco remain at Santa Fe as monuments to the failure of another ecclesiastico-military domination.

The Friars in California. — No more permanent results were attained by the Franciscan friar in California. However, the sword in this instance was not unsheathed. It was not necessary since the inert Indian offered no serious opposition to Spanish domination and Catholic faith. Hence a different method of exploitation could be employed. Since 1769, when the first settlement was made along that section of the Pacific Coast now called California, there was first established a garrison town, and in its wake followed the Spanish settlement and the Spanish Catholic mission. The latter was, moreover, most lavishly supported by the Spanish government. At the end of sixty-five years more than thirty thousand Indians were settled about some twenty-one missions, not so much as converts, however, as, largely, as dependents and servants, better, as serfs. Naturally, under this system of "conversion" the mission

prospered, that is, agriculturally and commercially; it acquired enormous wealth.

When, therefore, in 1834, the Spanish government freed the Indian from virtual slavery and allotted the cultivated lands about the missions in severalty to the Indians, only five thousand remained loyal to the Franciscan friars, and the large majority of the former "converts" reverted back to paganism. The missions, of course, were soon practically reduced to penury. Though in 1848, at the time of the annexation of California by the United States, the Spanish population had increased and some effort had been made to provide a parish ministry, not much else remained of the missions than the story of their former wealth.

(To be concluded.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Dr. E. G. Sihler, now traveling in Europe, particularly Italy, sends us the following impressionist communications:—

LETTER FROM ROME.

Written for THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Rome, May 11, 1924.

"Aeterna Urbs" the Romans began to call their town—when? When the Nordics began to break down the frontier of the Rhine and the Danube, and the New Persians troubled them on the Euphrates. Martin Luther was here in 1511 (Julius II), in the Renaissance period, after Alexander VI, after the other patrons of taste, re-entered Italian politicians and European diplomats, playing Spain against France, or *vice versa*, and still holding on to the Petrine power, the keys of heaven or hell in their hands, honoring the martyrs and still rivaling the world in all genuine worldliness. Never any one but an Italian cardinal is made Pope; it would not do otherwise; only such a one knows best the dispensation and mechanism near the apex of the hierarchy, the maintenance of which is a very important art, a very expensive thing, when you reflect a bit. When you survey St. Peter's, "St. Paul's outside the Walls," the Gesù, Pantheon, St. John Lateran, Santa Maria Maggiore, Santa Maria degli Angeli, and a score of others, vast and wonderful, the mere upkeep of this mass of edifices, let alone the support of veritable regiments of seminarists from every part of the globe,—no matter how rigid the economy of income and outgo,—it is a tremendous problem; and were the Papalini to rely only on the local support of the Tiber-town of to-day, as churches do in St. Louis, or Fort Wayne, or Chicago, they would soon be in great distress.

But I have intended, my dear Dr. Dau, to limit this epistle to something definite, concrete, and of importance to any one interested in the earlier Christian Church.

The greatest and most important of the apostles was beheaded under Nero, not very far from the Ostian Road, the Via Ostiensis, beyond the walls, and, as the great Italian epigraphist De Rossi suggests, was buried in the *coemeterium* on the Ostian Road, later designated as that of St. Lucina. All of such places, with their Greek typical name, *κοιμητήριον*, imposed from the beginning, were placed on some of the great highways leading out of Rome, such as the Salaria, Ostiensis, and others. The catacombs, it would seem, were constructed and used by the Christians from fear and in order that they might have separate and distinct burial-places. The catacombs, then, were a specific form of *coemeterium*.

Now, then, the inscriptions of Christian dead do not seem to have differed much, whether in catacomb or in *coemeterium*, along a highway leading out of Rome, later, in freedom. I spent some five hours in the cloisters of the Benedictine monastery contiguous to the superb basilica of "St. Paul's outside the Walls." For a Christian scholar the general interest in the subject is greatly enhanced, apart from language, history, grammar, and lettering, by the fact that here, in the famous Benedictine cloisters, carefully immured in the four sides of the same, we are privileged to examine Christian and pagan funeral inscriptions side by side. —

I shall begin this study with some quite unavoidable introductory matter. *Some* of the composite detail *now* preserved in St. Paul fuori le Mura is as old as the times of Theodosius, Alaric, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. In the apse of the great church there is a mosaic over the "High Altar of Our Lord" and the four evangelists in the stiff and stereotyped Byzantine manner, by tradition a gift of Galla Placidia, daughter of Theodosius (who died January 17, 395) ultimately married to Alaric's brother Ataulph [Adolf]. Of course, in the various conflagrations of the past these Byzantine mosaics have suffered, but they have been restored and are a perfect reproduction of the original.

But, faithful to our specific theme, we cannot tarry in the noble basilica which justly honors the incomparable services of the

"VAS ELECTIONIS ET DOCTOR GENTIUM"

(σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς), Acts 9, 15. We leave this sanctuary then and through a small door go out into the cloisters of the Benedictine monastery, which, by the by, is very old, begun by Abbot Peter of Capua († 1208), completed under Abbot John V (1208—1241). The Latin inscription in mosaic lettering made after completion claims for this KOENOBIVM the first rank in the Rome of that time. We are reminded at once by a large inscription on a marble tablet of the conservation due to Pius IX (who lost the secular powers in 1870). I will set it down in the original form, together with the elegiac distich concluding this rendering of thanks. (N. stands for *Nostrum* or *Nostrum*.)

"Pius IX Pont. Max. Koenobium N. splendidiore cultu maiestaque munifice cumulavit, quod discent posteris ad Principis optimi et Koenobii N. incrementum honoris

Abbas et Monachi
Casin. *Μνημόσυρον* sacravimus.
AN. MDCCCLVII."

All of this is concluded with this elegiac distich:—

"Sospitet, o semper Paulus te maxime Princeps,
Et tecum geminum sospitet Imperium."

In these two lines, then, we have, in a concrete and impressive manner, two great principles of post-apostolic and grossly unscriptural dogmas, or theses: *one*, that St. Paul can be prayed to, or appealed to, to *sospitare*, to preserve one who prays to him, *now*. The other is the *geminum imperium*, the secular and spiritual domination of the bishop of Rome, a power, the gradual and unceasing acquisition of which constitutes much of the core and kernel of what is called the Middle Ages.

But I will now go on to edit for my Western readers a number of the inscriptions (funeral inscriptions), which I myself transcribed from the marble slabs of long ago. The first one is one "made," or consecrated, by a priestess of Cybele or the Magna Mater (whose cult was brought into Rome from Phrygia, and in whose "honor" the *Ludi Megalenses* were annually celebrated in Rome, from the Hannibalian times onward).

D. M. [Dis Manibus]

"Sepulchrum hoc sive C epota [?] fiolum [?] AELIA ANTIGONAS ac [Sac]erdos M. D. M. [= Magnae Deorum Matris] viva ipsa [during her own lifetime] sibi et Epulonio felicissimo EM . . . V . . . marito dulcissimo et Libertis Libertabusque eorum fecit." (This *fecit* recurs continually, commemorating the person, as a rule, who provided a place for the urns, cinerary receptacles.) The exact size of the plot purchased for this end is very often added in these inscriptions, as, *e. g.*, in the following:—

D. M. [Dis Manibus]: L. Fabricius Demetrius et Fabricia Paezusa (*Παιζουσα*) Fecer. [fecerunt] Filiae B. M. [bene merenti] Fabriciae Dorcadi (*Δορκάδι*) et M. Iunio Leoni M. Iunio Ianuario M. Iunio Secundo Lib. [Libertis] Libertab[us] Post[eris] eor[um].

In F. P. X, in A. P. X, that is, *in fronte* [on the highway], Pedes X, *in agro* [the plot, measuring at right angles from the *via*] Pedes X.

Relief portraits sometimes were chiseled by Roman sculptors on the front of a sarcophagus, as was the case both in pagan, and, probably after 312 (Constantine's Edict of Recognition of the Christian Religion), on the sarcophagi containing the bodies of Christian dead; these, of course, of a wealthier class. One may say quite positively that the *absence* of "*D. M.*" was a proof or mark of a Christian burial.

The proportion of *Greek* names is one of the most striking features of these inscriptions, originally freedmen or freedwomen, whose services and importance in the household of the Roman aristocracy of course *always* greatly outweighed the place and esteem accorded to Gauls, Phrygians, Germans, Thracians, Syrians, Libyans, and Egyptians.

I will now present a few specimens of such Greek freedmen or freedwomen (*Liberti, Libertae*). One of the best preserved in the collection at St. Paul's is the following:—

D. M.

M. Ulpius Aug[usti] Lib[ertus] *Zosimus* cum Ulpia Doride marita sua fecerunt sibi et suis Lib[ertis] Libertabusque Posterisque eorum, et Iulius *Posidonius* [another Greek name] cum suis Lib. Libertabusque Posterisque eorum.

Now follows a warning to the coming owners not to alienate this funeral plot: Si quis hoc monumentum socciorum [phonetic spelling] vendiderit, sive donatum fecerit, inferet Aerario P. R. [into the Treasury] HS. [sestertia] XMN.

In F. P. XI, IN AGRO P. XII.

Another Greek — a freedwoman married to a Roman who has no traces of Greek ancestry in *his* name:—

DIS MANIBVS

M. Vari Stepti, Arria *Lycoris* coningi bene merenti fecit.

I now subjoin a Christian inscription clearly of post-Constantinian times. It was chiseled on a tablet which is still a solid and integral part of the massive and ponderous lid resting on an enormous sarcophagus, bespeaking for the deceased a (*quondam*) position in life of wealth. We note the belief in the intercession of saints, apostles, and martyrs. Also, the inscription intimates that Paul (and Peter too) were buried in the *coemeterium* on the Via Ostiensis: "Te Petrus et Paulus servant, Petre, Leonis dent animā [c. m.] dent celo [caelo], quos [namely, Peter and Paul] tam devotus amasti et Qib. [quibus] est idem tumulus, sit gloria tecum."

I will say at once that the two initial letters of our Lord's name ✱ are almost universal and ever-recurrent on these funeral tablets of the Christians; also the olive-branch, or the dove of the ark with it in her beak. Also the *alpha* and *omega* appear not rarely. Once I observed them in this form:—



The date is the thirteenth year of the Emperor Theodosius, 391 A. D., the time also of Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, with the Goths ever menacing the Alpine frontiers, only nineteen years before Augustine began his great work *De Civitate Dei*.

The following seems to have been the epitaph of a Christian presbyter:—

Illic requiescit in Pace Sabinus ... us PRÊ .. ♡ .. ANNS, qui bissit [= vixit] ANNVS [= annos] LIIII et DIES XXIIII. DP [depositus] Kal. AGUST. [Kalendis Augustis] coñs. SVMM. ET BOETIO V. C. cons. [= consulibus Symmacho et Boethio viris claris consulibus].

I shall close this letter from Rome with an inscription evidently referring to a clerical person or preacher, in elegiac distichs; the last words are illegible.

Hic Benedictus adest merito sub rupe sepulchri
 Quem tenet Angelicus Coetus in Arce Poli
 Qui fuerat Fortuna pius, Natura decorus,
 Moribus et castis, fulsit in Orbe satis,
 Dogmatis egregie prorsus Documenta ministrans,
 Ostendit multis lucis adire viam.
 Aurea saec[u]la cui pateant sine fine per Aevum
 Sorte beatifica. SCAND[it?]I VIAE.

"Sub rupe sepulchri" seems to point to catacombs, and still the general context bespeaks the period when, after 311—12 the Christian Church had become free and untrammelled.

There is a classic and cultured elegance in these distichs which requires no commentary. Aurea saecula, golden age. Bliss: per aevum = *aiōna*.

As for the largest of the catacombs, that of Callistus on the Via Appia, the very bowels of the earth seemed to open to me when, with other tourists, I descended into this labyrinth of subterranean crypts. All bore little candles, led by a swiftly lecturing monk, whose Italian I followed fairly well.

The use of *Greek script* is impressive in the fragments of tablets. Thus Acilia Vera appears as

ΑΚΕΛΙΑ ΒΗΡΑ, or:

A ✱ Ω — or: ΡΟΔΩΝ

Also the fish in symbol, because ΙΧΘΥΣ incorporates the initials: Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ. And with this, the greatest of all names, I will close this classic and Christian epistle.

LETTER FROM FLORENCE.

Florence, Italy, June 1, 1924.

It is Sunday afternoon, very sunny and as warm as it may be on the Mississippi at this time. The deep and noble peals of Santa Cruce, vesper bells, are filling the air as I am beginning to write.

I shall, of course, here not remind you of Giotto, Donatello Brammante, Brunelleschi, Marsiglio Ficino, Dante, Amerigo Vespucci (who gave his forename to the New World), Michelangelo, and other eminent Florentines, nor of the Medici who furnished three incumbents in the annals of the Papacy, Leo X, Clement VII, and one less significant than these two.

The Middle Ages and the Renaissance are ever about us whenever we stir about in this supremely historical Abode of the Past. Dante's works became the standard speech for Italy as Luther's for *his* land, speech that one cannot adequately render into any other tongue.

As to the Renaissance, the Medici, and *Savonarola*, your library has perhaps the noted work of Dr. Rudelbach, 1836, which is still cited by the *Britannica* (XI. ed.) as a standard work. And Rudelbach

(Muldetal) was the man who gave to Dr. W. Sihler what I may call his theological passport in 1843, eighty-one years ago. Now, in more recent times, the works of the eminent Florentine historian of more recent times (works dealing with the Medici and with the Renaissance), *Villari*, are of very superior merit and utterly free from the incense of mandatory ecstasy so often spread over that period. They have also been translated into English. There is a huge field for the new library of the Concordia — God bless her — in her fourth metamorphosis or, better, her fourth stage of history in her important annals.

My readers know that in my larger works I have laid very great stress on the authority of sources, for which mere cleverness or would-be originality of the historian is really no tolerable or endurable surrogate or substitute, no more than chicory is for breakfast coffee.

The Cathedral of Florence was begun in Dante's time (A.D. 1265), and when Boniface VIII, that ultraarrogant would-be vicegerent of God on earth "sat" in the chair [?] of Peter, 1296. This superb church was dedicated March 25, 1436, by Eugene IV in the Era of the Great Councils.

I shall content myself by merely transcribing with little or no exegetical comment several inscriptions which I copied in the Duomo of St. Maria di Fiore during my present sojourn on the Arno. — Under Brunelleschi's dome proper, on the wall on the south side, I copied the following (pointing, of course, my own): —

1. Anno a Christi ortu MCCIIIC [1298] Florentini magnis divitiis partis et rebus domi forisque commode constitutis, cum urbem moenibus anxissent pulcherrimisque aedificiis publice decorassent, ut rem divinam quoque optime ordinarent et posteris insignis magnificentiae et religionis suae exemplum proderent, hoc augustissimum templum in Dei honorem eiusque Matris, semper Virginis Mariae, instituerunt, et Pontificio Legato Cardinale praesento primumque lapidem ponente, summa cum omnium laetitia ac devotione inchoarunt VI Id. Septembris [= September 8, 1298].

2. The following deals with a quondam bishop of Florence, St. Zenobius. The inscription deals with, illustrates for us non-Romans, the saint-worship which the Roman practise has superimposed on the New Testament, together with the popular and still maintained superstition and vicious legendary lore. I subjoin my copy. There is no chronological datum in the inscription. (I refer particularly to the miracle-producing potency of bones, etc.)

Cum Divi Zenobii Corpus in S. Laurentii Aede conditum esset atque ob admiranda eius opera maiori in dies frequentia celebraretur, Andreas, qui proxime Zenobio in episcopatu successerat, eum honorem isti potissimum, cui praefuerat ecclesiae deberi arbitratu, convocatis ex vicinis urbibus Episcopis, civitate gestiente, et insigne arboris in area reviviscentis floresque fundentis miraculum obstupescente, in hanc longe quam nunc est humiliorem basilicam illustri pompa transtulit.

Clearly there was a smaller and meaner edifice or cathedral church before, whether on the same spot is an antiquarian matter.

3. *The Dedication*: Ob insignem magnificentiam civitatis et Templi Eugenius P. P. IIII omni solemnitate adhibita dedicavit Die XXV Martii MCCCCXXXVI [1436], cuius dedicationis gratia pons ligneus insigni magnificentia et ornatu factus est ab Ecclesia Sancte [this is the spelling] Marie Novelle [church still is there, unchanged], ubi P. P. inhabitabat, usque ad hanc Ecclesiam [the cathedral to be dedicated], per quem veniens Pontifex cum Cardinalibus et Episcopis ceterisque Procesibus [Grandus] pontificali habitu ad dedicandum accessit. [No mention of any secular person or governmental representative of the Republic of Florence.] Tanta enim multitudo ad spectandum convenerat ut pre [= prae] nimia turba viam obsidente nisi per pontem commode transire Pontifex non potuisset.

4. Of Napoleonic times, a curious memorial. This is of Pius VII, who was kept as Napoleon's prisoner of state in the last years of the Corsican's domination. It is a document also of the papal self-consciousness, which cannot fail to be instructive to theological readers. This, too, I copied directly in the cathedral on Saturday afternoon, May 31, 1924:—

Anno MDCCCXV Pius VII, Pontifex Maximus, insigni ex [over] hostibus ecclesiae [Napoleon is meant] triumpho praefulgens, cum civitatem [Florence] praesentia sua exhilararet, Kalendis Iuniis, qui dies fuit A. F. sacrosancti corporis D. [domini] N. [nostri] octavus in hoc Metropolitano Templo mane ad aram principem Hostiam divinam immolavit, Zenobii Dioecesis Florentinae sospitatoris caelestes expositos cineres veneratus est. Hinc ad aulam comitalem Canonicorum [assembly hall of the canons of the Cathedral] divertit Klerumque [thus spelled — κλήρος] pedis osculo dignatus comitate adloquii beavit vespere [vespero] diei eiusdem sacramentum augustum sollemni anniversaria pompa circumlatum cum Patribus Cardinalibus et Episcopis et asseclis prosequens populi laetitiam explevit maiestatisque suae adspectu pietatem incendit adauxit.

It cannot be my purpose to write *much* about Girolamo Savonarola. I am actually penning these lines barely half a mile away from the spot where, with two of his most faithful conventual adherents of the Dominican monastery of San Marco, he was first hanged and then burned to ashes on the Piazza di Signoria (government square) in Florence on May 23, 1498. (See Villari, Rudelbach, etc.) It so happened that on the morning after our arrival in the famous city on the Arno, May 23, 1924, I was walking through the throngs there, seeking for the bronze memorial plate set in the pavement. I found it soon enough; it was encircled with an exquisite garland of rare flowers, while a young man was distributing a memorial leaflet, by the by, faithful to the papal order and not mentioning the infamous Alexander VI except in a respectful manner. It relates also how Alexander's successor, the papal imperialist, soldier, diplomat, general, Julius II, had Raffael give a place to Savonarola in the famous *Disputa* in the Vatican and said to the Domin-

icans of Viterbo, "I might canonize him!" and how (*sic!*) the "sainted bishop of Rochester [England] who fell a victim to the hatred of the heretics, was going to see in him [Savonarola] the vigorous defender of the Catholic faith and [chronology!!] the strongest assailant of the vicious assertions of Luther."

The article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (XI. ed.) is by Linda Mary, an Englishwoman, then the wife of the admirable historian Prof. Villari of Florence, who died at an advanced age in 1916.

I shall now copy the inscription as I copied it *in situ*, with the profile of the martyred monk above the words: "Qui dove con I suoi confratelli Ira Domenigo Buonvicini e Ira Silvestro Maruffi il 23 Maggio del MCCCCXCVIII per iniqua sentenza fu impiccato ed arso Ira Girolamo Savonarola. Dopo quattro secoli fu collocata questa memoria."



"Here [is] [the spot] where with his fellow-monks Brother Domenico Buonvicini and Brother Silvestro Maruffi, on May 23, 1498, through an unjust verdict, there was hanged and burned Brother Jerome Savonarola. After four centuries there was placed this memorial."

In the marble entablature over the chief portal before the Palazzo Vecchio there are still chiseled the following:—



Y H S
 REX REGVM ET
 DOMINVS
 DOMINANTIVM

The abbot of San Marco himself, who, after the death of Lorenzo de Medici, 1492, for a few years was the virtual ruler of Florence (as Calvin later was of Geneva), had these words cut there.

This famous monastery, scrupulously and admirably preserved, is now a national museum. In the corridor, close to the two little cells which contained his couch and his "office," there is a copy of a famous oil-painting (original in the Corsini Gallery on the Arno). It represents his execution, with an almost photographic liveliness of detail. The Piazza and the grim Palazzo Vecchio are there precisely as now, with the famous Loggia of Orcagna on the right: a platform before the Palazzo Vecchio holds the judges, sitting; the three culprits in white garments kneel before them. Farther on there is a roadway of equal height on which the three victims are escorted to the scaffold, each attended by two clerical attendants in black. Their faces and heads are hooded. Finally there are the gallows, with the three men hanging. Below a fire of bundles of fagots has begun to burn, and city servants are fetching more bundles.

In one of Savonarola's cells there is still preserved the garment of delicate texture which Savonarola was wont to wear under all his garments, especially in his last years, when he preached to the Florentines in their cathedral: the crucified Savior and the text:

"Praedicamus ✠ crucifixum."

With cordial greetings to all readers of these lines,

E. G. SIHLER, Concordia, 1872.

DAU.

In John 7, 38 the meaning of *κοιλία* has given the exegetes trouble. Burney, in his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford, 1922), thinks that the Greek term was chosen because the original Aramaic *ma'yan*, "fountain," was misread for *me'in*, "bowels." He holds that the Lord referred to a symbolism of the Egyptians and Mesopotamians by which the genius of fertility was depicted as holding a spouting vase to his breast, from which streams flowed watering the entire earth. Burney proposes to render John 7, 37. 38 thus: "(He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me; and let him drink) that believeth on Me; as the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow from the fountain of living water." W. F. Albright, of the American School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem, in the *Harvard Theological Review* for April, rejects Burney's conjecture because it "changes the meaning of the text so completely as to spoil it." He holds that it is unnecessary to go back to the aforementioned ancient symbolism, because "we must remember that *κοιλία* meant to the ancient not 'belly' in the vulgar modern sense, but 'seat of the liver and reins,' where the true source of being and thought was fancied to be — a popular conception which was but slowly dislodged. Jesus meant that the Holy Spirit, entering into the hearts of men, would make them a source of purity and truth to all around them." This is the correct scope of the remark of Jesus: From the believer himself, from his inmost heart, filled with the Holy Spirit and the knowledge of Jesus, shall flow rivers of the same water of life which he took into himself abundantly when he came to Jesus and drank from the fountain of saving truth.

DAU.

Regarding the place of John's baptism, Arnon, near Salim, John 3, 23, Albright holds that the ecclesiastical tradition as reflected by Eusebius must be wrong because it located Salim in the Plain of Scythopolis, identifying it with Salumias. "It is hard to understand why John should have come to the region of the heathen city of Scythopolis in order to baptize Jews, and harder to understand the comment, 'because there was much water there,' if he baptized so near the Jordan. Instead of remaining at a spring or springs only a mile from the Jordan, according to the patristic theory, he would naturally have baptized in the Jordan, just as he did farther south. The comment in question is obviously intended to explain why he chose a place so far removed from the Jordan as Arnon. . . . Now, Conder pointed out long ago (*Memoirs of Survey of Western Palestine*, Vol. II, p. 234) that Arnon, near Salim, must be modern Ainun, with identically the

same name, nearly eight miles northeast of Salim. It is true that the modern site has no water, but the name alone — Ainun goes back to the Hebrew Ainon, from *ain*, 'fountain' — shows that the ancient village of this name lay nearer the head of the Wadi Far'ah, now three miles away, either at Hirbetes-Smeit or at Tammun. Wadi Far'ah is a perennial stream, with fine springs at its source, and in ancient times pools, where immersion could be conveniently practised. In fact, it is the nearest suitable place of baptism to Neapolis, the Samaritan center. There can be little doubt that John preached to the Samaritans as well as to the Jews proper; otherwise it would be very hard to explain how his name came to be associated with that of the Samaritan Dositheus. Moreover, there is surely some nucleus of truth in the persistent tradition which places his burial-place at Sebaste (Samaria). Here, therefore, we have a clear case in which the Gospel of John is more accurate in its topographical documentation than Eusebius or the other patristic students of Palestinian topography." Regarding the place near the wilderness, called Ephraim, John 11, 54, where Jesus spent the interval before the Passover with His disciples, Albright says: "It is generally believed that Ephraim is et-Taiyibeh, a Christian village lying more than 2,800 feet above sea-level, in a climate very inclement during the winter — not at all the kind of spot one would expect Jesus to select for the purpose. Nor is it 'near the wilderness.' The writer has elsewhere tried to show (*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. III, pp. 36—40) that Ephraim is clearly located both in the Old Testament, the Talmud, and church-fathers, at Samieh, in the wide and beautiful valley of the same name, lying east of Tell 'Asur. The place was important in the Canaanite and early Israelite times, to judge from the tombs and pottery alone, and survived, as shown by tombs, pottery, and inscriptions, into the late Byzantine period. Samieh is a secluded, almost inaccessible valley and is only 1,400 feet above sea-level, protected on all sides by lofty hills, and with an abundant water-supply. It thus fulfils all the conditions, and the identification may be regarded as virtually certain, since the only other claimant, Noaran, has been located definitely at 'Ain-Duq. Again we find that the writer of our gospel was possessed of singularly accurate information regarding the geography of Palestine." These studies are interesting to the Church because in her belief the inerrancy of Scripture takes in also the Bible geography, history, natural history, etc.

DAU.

As a rebuke, no doubt, of the censorious spirit these words were written: "Judging the importance of things by the degree in which they lend themselves to public contentiousness, a standard of values peculiar to the parliamentary age, we inevitably give to evil a prominence to which it is not really entitled. For there is more to be *said* about evil things than there is about good things, more about vice than about virtue; more about sickness than about health. . . . The vocabulary of blame is wider than the vocabulary of praise; its terms are more easily found, and the habit of using them is more rapidly

acquired; while fear (the mother of accusation) is more voluble than courage, which is, on the whole, a very silent quality and indistinguishable, in its higher manifestations, from love. If you cultivate the eloquence of blame, the scope of your indictment will expand without limit; the more you say, the more will remain to be said, and you may go on making speeches forever. But if (like St. Francis) you cultivate the eloquence of praise, you will be met at every stage of your progress by a law of Diminishing Returns. As you pass from the evil to the good, from the good to the better, from the better to the best, you will find it continually harder to do justice to your theme; the satisfaction of 'hitting the mark,' so easily found when abuses are being exposed or lies nailed to the counter, will now be increasingly difficult to find; the area of discourse will contract, its values acquiring an intensity which language cannot overtake; you will have less and less to say, until, at last, when you come to the Very Best, you will be struck completely dumb and have nothing to say at all. The Very Best is no theme for oratory. The bias of the tongue being always in the direction of indictment, it is easy to understand how the habit has arisen of interpreting our social system in terms of evil rather than of good." (L. P. Jacks, in *Hibbert Journal*.) There is more to be said about this evil, and the writer was close enough to seeing the real truth of the matter to enable him to say more. The genius for faultfinding, the carping critic, the acrimonious mind, are themselves part of the evil that is in this world due to man's corrupt nature, and sanctifying grace battles with them continually. Outside of this grace it is difficult to see how much good can be said about a world that lieth in wickedness and whose very righteousnesses are as filthy rags. Given a better world with nobler men in it, the vocabulary of the race would automatically lose some of its terms and acquire others. You can have no name for that which does not exist. It is an old Latin axiom, used indeed in a different connection, but applicable here: *Modus loquendi sequitur modum essendi*. Let any one examine the Scriptures on this score and catalog their wealth of terms in both Testaments for sin, for instance, in the small confine of the first two verses of Ps. 32. The Bible speaks from a comprehensive perception of the realities of life because it is the voice of the all-seeing God. If men had made it, they would most likely have made it speak in Pollyanna style: "Oh, I am so happy!" etc. Thank God, there are still things in this world that are true, things that are honest, things that are just, things that are pure, things that are lovely, things that are of good report, and virtues and praiseworthy things, Phil. 4, 8; and Christ Himself will call attention to them at His Second Coming, Matt. 25, 35 f. But they exist only in the realm of grace as products of the Spirit of Christ that works in men. Gal. 5, 19—23.

DAU.

American Lutheran Church Untouched by Modernism?—From the *Lutheran Church Herald* (May 20) is gleaned the following: "The writer of 'Radio Broadcasts' in the *Presbyterian* pays this tribute to the American Lutherans: 'It is the glory of Luther's chil-

dren in the United States that their ministry and laity are untouched by this war of unbelief that is moving like an epidemic across the land. This is the more impressive when we recall that much of this unbelief is the harvest of seeds sown in German universities, a generation or more ago, in the name of Higher Criticism. Indeed, it is this outstanding fact that has been so powerful an argument among them against the wisdom of giving a welcome to the novel contradictions of beliefs in unbeliefs. A gifted Lutheran minister, recently returned from a visit to Germany, spoke before the Luther League in the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., on 'Our Sick Mother.' It was a sad story of discovery that his investigations had brought him. The great Church of the Reformation has so largely abandoned in Germany the doctrines of the Reformation that, having no definite message for the people, the people no longer come to church. Everywhere he found the pews empty, the families indifferent, the public unbelieving, and thousands in actual hostility to all that the Church stands for in her decadent state. The fact that since Modernism took the Bible of Luther from the entire Protestant section of Germany and left her a prey to every destroying philosophy that might be cast at her, has seemed sufficient argument in the minds of American Lutherans to close the door against the destroying wolf as he seeks to enter their church in this country. It is a simple argument with them and runs thus: If Modernism damned Germany when once in power there, Modernism will damn America if once in power here. How far we have been 'untouched by this war of unbelief that is moving like an epidemic across the land' no one can tell. Let us hope and pray that we may be spared yet for many years from this destructive rationalism threatening evangelical Christianity in so many denominations."—Visits from Lutheran churchmen of Europe, of more than dubious orthodoxy, which are made the occasion of much flamboyant oratory and spectacular fraternizing here in America, Lutheran world congresses with their gushing declarations of the unity of its members, with sporadic heroic utterances of what really constitutes unity, etc.,—these things do not look very promising for the future of the old Lutheran faith in America. The words of Washington about "entangling alliances" are assuming an ominous meaning to American Lutherans.

DAU.

Carlyle's attitude to the Bible is brought out in a volume of his letters just published. He writes to John Stuart Mill on January 20, 1834: "Best of all do I sympathize with you in regard to the New Testament. Every word I say is spoken out of my heart. Great, soul-inspiring, unfathomable in significance, is that poor artless Biography by St. Matthew! Of all *Antigigmen* too, in any time, in any place, the greatest is that divine Hero of St. Matthew. A thousand times have His words, even through all *these* impediments, brought life and hope back into my heart: I have wept warm tears as I thought of *Him*; and how the voice of his Glad Tidings (the *gladdest* of all; for it was of man's indefeasible divineness [!]) had gone forth to all lands, had reached even the English land and me. 'Be of good cheer!

I have overcome the world: I! — if you consider that, and who the *I* was, a whole Gospel lies in it. — St. John I regard with you as a kind of *didactic* Biographer, less taken up with his hero than what he fancies to be his hero's philosophy; of far inferior value therefore; less artless, perhaps one might say less sincere. On the whole, it is the thorough *heartiness*, the intense and entire *sincerity* of the Bible that makes it still the Book of Books. In no other book is there the same quality in such a degree; some touches of it (under circumstances strangely new) I meet with in Goethe, almost alone of the moderns. I advise you to persevere in reading the Bible (in *seeing* it, through all distances and disguises): that here, too, you have discarded *Dilettantism* and can earnestly look at the *Earnest*, this is a new pleasure to me." On June 13, 1833, he writes: "Will you understand me if I say there is still no book in the whole world where I find the Spiritual Warfare of Men tenth-part so faithfully delineated, so cheerfully too, and instructively when once you have got to *read* it, as in the Jewish *Book*, well named the Book of Books? I protest, it is even so. In fine, then, I bid you go on unflinchingly, not resting till your 'Doubting Castle' Prison is burst asunder; *love* the Truth, and the Truth now as heretofore *will* make you free." How little of the essential and exclusive contents of the Scriptures had Carlyle learned! Still his case shows that the Bible need not fear the scrutiny even of an agnostic genius. The cheapest trash spoken and written is that of modern Bible critics and *litterateurs* who claim to have found in the Bible nothing but myths and folk-lore. A generation or two ago they durst not have shown their faces in the society of real literary men.

DAU.

When Charles R. Brown, Dean of the Yale Divinity School, in the autumn of 1923 delivered lectures at New Haven which have now been published under the title *Why I Believe in Religion*, for each successive lecture a bigger hall had to be engaged. It is said that if he had chosen to deliver a seventh lecture, — his book contains six, — he would have had to go to the Yale Bowl to accommodate his audience. A writer in *Scribner's* for June thinks that this proves that "no subject is more interesting than religion." That is certainly a fact. The pity is only that the great throngs at New Haven were treated to a poor exhibition of the true religion. (On Brown's view of religion see THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, June, 1924, p. 185.) Lutheran noonday services during Lent have everywhere attracted the attention of the greater public, and it is regrettable that we have so far made these attempts to place our faith before the public only at this season. We have not yet exhausted our possibilities.

DAU.

Anent Academic Degrees. — A knowing smile will wreath the countenances of our unsophisticated readers when reading the following item communicated to an American magazine writer by one of our scholars: "You may be interested to know that a colleague of mine in Zurich, quite a young man and therefore not a mere *laudator temporis acti*, writes me with a sigh audible in spite of the distance that the conferring of doctorates in the German and French univer-

sities is now largely influenced by political considerations. This is too bad; but what does all this matter when we consider that even after a development of hundreds of thousands of years since the stage of the pithecanthropos the majority of people still refuse, or at least dislike, to see things as they are? However, *sat prata biberunt*." Honor to whom honor is due, by all means. That is a Scriptural principle. Moreover, if the obtaining of an academic degree is the only door to recognition for efficiency, by all means let us get the degree and prove that we are worth it. But outside of these considerations, is it not a funny rule for regulating our esteem of some one by his titular appendage?

DAU.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window.—The outrageous charge of Ahab addressed to Elijah: "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" 1 Kings 18, 17, comes to mind as one reads the remarks in the *Herald and Presbyter* about "some unthinking people who lay all the blame for the controversy in the Church to-day on the loyal and evangelical men who are defending the faith." The only flaw in the parallel is that "the loyal and evangelical men" among the Fundamentalists as compared with the Modernists are not as loyal and evangelical as they think they are.

Dr. Wilhelm Walther, the Luther scholar, for many years Professor of Historical Theology at the University of Rostock, died April 24 in the hospital at Rostock after a severe illness of twelve days, so a *News Bulletin* of the N. L. C. reports.

From the same source are the following two items: The Committee on Moral and Social Welfare of the U. L. C. will submit to the convention at Chicago in October the following resolution: "In accordance with the Sixteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession we believe that it is right for Christians to engage in just wars and to serve as soldiers. We also believe that the time has come when it is necessary to stress the fact that nationalism and internationalism are not mutually exclusive terms, that patriotism and the love of other nations and races are supplementary, that the processes employed by and within the nation to secure justice, fair play, and stability, must be employed in an increasing measure in the dealings between nations, that the arbitrament of arms should yield more and more to the arbitrament of reason and of law, that the Christian citizen is pledged as such to exert every effort through the establishment of some agency for the furtherance of justice and good will in his own country and in the commonwealth of nations."

Through the visits of foreign students to German universities, says *Vox Studentum* (Vienna) has arisen a most interesting and useful department in the University of Berlin, known as "The German Institute for Foreigners," the object of which is to teach foreign students and foreign residents what it is necessary that they should know about Germany. Literature specially prepared from every point of view is given throughout the year on the language, literature, art, history, education, and economic conditions of the country. A monthly magazine is printed with information about the institute, announcements of good plays and concerts, articles on German art and literature, and a supplement on language study. Visits are paid to museums, schools, factories, and other points of interest, and study tours throughout the country are arranged. The result is said to be a kindlier attitude between the foreign visitors and the people with whom they come in contact and a better understanding of the national problems of their respective countries.

During the first two weeks in June the Walther League carried out a Relief Clothing Endeavor for the war-stricken and suffering in Europe, especially Germany.

William D. Guthrie's article "The Oregon Compulsory School Law" in the *Columbia Magazine*, June, 1924, has been published as a separate print. It is a most interesting review of the decision of the United States District Court of Oregon, by which the law which would have closed all private schools in Oregon in 1926 was declared unconstitutional. It makes plain, in particular, the share which the Masonic Order had in framing and passing this odious legislation, and the counteraction of Roman Catholicism against it. But the greatest credit for the repeal of this offensive measure belongs to Lutherans, who paved the way for it by the suit *Meyer versus Nebraska*, 262, and the suit *Nebraska District of Evangelical Lutheran Synod versus McKelvie*, 187, N. W. 927.

The reference to Horace (see THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY 4, 183) has been furnished by a number of our pastors and professors who still keep up their reading in the old classics. It is found in the Third Satire of the First Book, line 68.

After having been closed six years, the Theological Academy of the Russian Church at Moscow has been reopened under the liberalist leadership of Metropolitan Eudaken. A Methodist member of the faculty, Dr. G. Hecker, delivered the inaugural address in Russian before great crowds of listeners. The program of the institution henceforth will be to train pastors and evangelists in place of the former priests and liturgists.

Roman Catholic lawyers in Prussia are employing their astuteness, says the *Lutheran* (May 29), "for finding ways and means to bring about the reverting of confiscated church property to their original owners in town and country, these holdings having been of a sacred character, therefore not subject to common law.... The famous monastery in Heisterbach shall be restored in every sense. The State is in dire need of money."

Dr. Machen said recently in the *Presbyterian*: "The dangerous Towner-Sterling Bill in Congress has as its ultimate tendency (whatever temporary safeguards there may be) the establishment of a uniformity of education, which is the most appalling calamity into which any nation could fall. It would be difficult to imagine, at any rate, a worse tyranny than that of the Oregon type. Place children in their formative years under the despotic control of experts appointed by the State, and you have a really more effective interference with civil and religious liberty than the Inquisition, perhaps, ever achieved. It is true that hopeful signs are not altogether absent. The abominable Lusk Laws in the State of New York, though by the scantiest majority, were repealed; and the decision written by Justice McReynolds, of the United States Supreme Court, concerning the Nebraska language law (which practically made literary education a crime) shows that the principles of American liberty are not yet entirely dead. But the danger is certainly very great." All the coercive and restrictive measures with which we are being cursed in recent years are merely paving the way for Rome-rule in our country. Rome waits till its time for action comes, and then it will build its coercive and restrictive measures up on recent precedents.

American Masons touring Palestine held a lodge-meeting and posed for a propaganda photograph at the entrance to the caves of Solomon just outside Jerusalem, "at the place from which the stone for Solomon's

Temple was taken, considered the cradle of Masonry." (See the photographure in *Current Opinion* for June, p. 787.) For its real cradle Masons will have to go considerably lower down.

If you wish to be up to date, you will drop the term "Teutonic" from your vocabulary and substitute "Nordic" for it.

For our collection of last sayings of renowned persons we may note this from the last work of G. Stanley Hall, the psychologist: "Man's future on this earth is the real, only, and gloriously sufficient fulfilment of his hopes. The great things which we once dreamt of in another world we must now strive to attain here, and after draining all the draughts of bitter and sweet that Nature has brewed for us, we shall sink back satisfied into the arms of the all-mother, whence we sprang." The people who proposed to make Germany happy by introducing their present order of things over there used to sing:

*Den Himmel ueberlassen wir
Den Engeln und den Spatzen.*

Stanley Hall's valedictory is attuned to the same melody.

"Just as the Roman Catholic Church insists that the Pope is not subject to Italian jurisdiction, so has Islam to face the problem of obtaining a caliph who shall be truly international in status." (*Current Opinion*, June, p. 771.) The difference between the *antichristus major et minor* or the *antichristus occidentalis et orientalis* is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

And so the *Cosmopolitan* marches in the Roman Catholic propaganda procession. In its July issue it features as its leading story Mary Roberts Rinehart's *Her Majesty, the Queen*, with obliging illustrations exhibiting a gorgeous scene in which "a prince of the blood," alias prelate, in the proper gaudy outfit, reads the marriage service for a king and his bride, surrounded by their noble *entourage*, and another showing the Roman confessional in action, with penitent and confessor. Judging by the rate of profit and loss which determines for commercial enterprises what they must do or not do, incidents like the above would indicate that America is already more than half Catholic. A generation ago such an incident would have been impossible. But it may be that we are expected to read a publication like the above as "advertisement" printed in the form of a story, as in our daily paper, and understand that it is paid for, though not marked so.

D.A.T.

BOOK REVIEW.

Christliche Dogmatik. Von Dr. Franz Pieper. Erster Band. XII and 690 pages. Price, \$5.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The suspense in which the readers of Dr. Pieper's *Dogmatics* were kept since 1917, when Vol. II appeared, has been happily broken, and the author's work is now completed. In his Preface the author explains the reason for the sequence that was adopted for the publication of the three volumes of his work. "The reason is because a wish was expressed that in the great year of the [Reformation] Jubilee, 1917, that volume should be published first which presents the doctrines of the grace of God in Christ, the person and the work of Christ, and justification. The second volume naturally had to be followed by the third [in 1920], in which the consequences of the Christian doctrine of justification are described." The present volume divides into seven chapters of disproportionate length: On the Nature and Concept of Theology, pp. 1—232; On Holy Scripture, pp. 233—444; On the Doctrine of God, pp. 445—569; On the Creation of the World and of Man, pp. 570—586; On Divine Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the World, pp. 587—602; On the Angels, pp. 603—616; On the Doctrine of Man, pp. 617 to the end. The reason why more than half the space in the present volume is devoted to the discussion of the *Nature and Concept of Theology*, and of the *Holy Scriptures* "is explained by the fact that unchristian views of these matters have become domiciled in modern Protestant theology. This is but the necessary consequence of its defection from the Christian truth that the Holy Scriptures are God's own and infallible Word. Just as we have before us in the Roman Church a complete collapse, as regards principles, of Christian theology, because in that Church the subjective view of the Pope is the authority which determines everything, so we are confronted with the same situation in modern Protestant theology, because this theology has surrendered the objective divine authority of the Holy Scriptures and taken refuge in 'Christian experience,' that is, in the subjective view of the individual theologian (*des theologisierenden Subjekts*)."

As regards his presentation of *the doctrine of God*, the author says: "In this doctrine the difference between the natural and the Christian knowledge of God had to be treated at greater length because modern theology, extending even into circles that call themselves Lutheran, has become dynamistic—Unitarian." In his treatment of *the doctrine of man* the author found that the doctrine of sin at several points required lengthy expositions, since modern theology, because of its self-centered standpoint, has landed in the Roman-Zwinglian notion of a "sin without guilt." A most timely and intrinsically valuable *excursus* has been inserted on page 182 ff., in the chapter on what really constitutes theology, and how the theological fitness is attained. The author deplores the necessity which compelled him to insert this *excursus*, because he holds that it does not properly belong in a dogmatic treatise, and states the case as follows: "The matter in question is the charge emanating especially from Germany and voiced even in *dogmatic* treatises, viz., that within the Missouri Synod a 'theology of reprobation' is being cultivated which must be regarded as an evil in

the Christian Church. It is claimed that our theology, because it 'identifies' Scripture and the Word of God, leads to an 'intellectualism' which is not conducive to the rise of a vital 'Christianity of the heart.' Replying to this criticism and for the purpose of removing, if possible, the fright caused by the 'theology of repristination,' I had to show in a lengthy *excursus* what is the state of affairs in our church-body, said to be addicted to the 'theology of repristination.' Moreover, in order to maintain historical accuracy, I could not pass over the fact that the type of theology which has been declared a deplorable feature of the Missouri Synod is cultivated quite consciously also by other church-bodies. I point to Dr. Hoenecke's exhaustive *Evangelical Lutheran Dogmatics*, which evinces the fact that the doctrinal position of the Synod of Wisconsin and Other States is entirely congruent with the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod. Furthermore, there are embodied in this *excursus*, on pp. 199 ff., a few citations from a treatise published by Franz Delitzsch, in 1839, on the occasion of the tercentenary of the introduction of the Reformation in the city of Leipzig. The object, in view of these citations, is to prove that the American Lutheran Church of the 'strictly confessional type' has preserved, clearly exhibited, and practically applied what God had bestowed also on Germany well-nigh four hundred years ago. I transfer a few of Delitzsch's statements to this Preface. Delitzsch says: 'I confess, unabashed, that in matters of faith I am three hundred years behind the times; for after being held in error for a long time, I have learned to know that there is but *one* truth, that it is an everlasting, unchangeable truth, and that it is not in need of being sifted and improved upon because it has been revealed by God.' 'I am preaching *retrogression* to you, going back to the Word of God from which you have fallen away.' 'What I have stated and tried to vindicate is nothing else than the faith of the old Lutheran Church, to which our ancestors three hundred years ago, on the sacred festival of Pentecost, pledged their allegiance with fervent prayers of gratitude.' Nor was Delitzsch alone in his position. Even in his student days, in his later pastorate, and still as teacher of theology the author of this dogmatics had read with great interest and genuine joy of the heart some minor writings of Ernest Sartorius, to wit, *Die Religion ausserhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft* (1822), *Die Unwissenschaftlichkeit und innere Verwandtschaft des Rationalismus und Romanismus* (1825), *Von dem religioesen Erkenntnisprinzip* (1826). In all these writings we have an excellent presentation in dogmatic form of the genuine quality of Christian theology, with still greater clearness than in the writings of Delitzsch. Modern theologians of Germany should not be deterred from reading these and similar writings, dating back to Germany's season of revival, by the fact that the authors of these writings, under pressure of an unscientific theological science, at a later time themselves departed from the truth to which they had borne witness." — To enable the reader to form an estimate of the wealth of informing and stimulating literature contained in this volume of Dr. Pieper's *Dogmatics*, we offer the sketch which the author himself has prepared of the manner in which he has built up the various chapters of his book. His first chapter, *On the Essence and Concept of Theology* (*De Natura et Constitutione Theologiae*) subdivides as follows: 1. Arriving at an understanding

regarding the standpoint occupied, p. 1. 2. On religion in general, p. 6. 3. The number of religions in the world, p. 8. 4. The two sources from which religions actually existing draw their knowledge, p. 19. 5. The cause of parties in Christendom, p. 22. 6. Christianity the absolute religion, p. 36. 7. The Christian religion and Christian theology, p. 42. 8. Christian theology, p. 44. 9. Detailed description of theology viewed as *fitness*, p. 50. 10. Detailed description of theology viewed as *doctrine*, p. 56. 11. Divisions of theology viewed as doctrine, p. 84. Law and Gospel, p. 84. Fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, p. 89. Primary and secondary fundamentals, p. 95. Non-fundamental doctrines, p. 102. Open questions and theological problems, p. 104. 12. The Church and the ecclesiastical dogmas, p. 108. 13. The end which theology desires to attain in men, p. 116. 14. The external means by which theology attains its end in men, p. 118. 15. Theology and science, p. 119. 16. Theology and assurance, p. 123. 17. Theology and development of doctrine, p. 147. 18. Theology and freedom of teaching, p. 154. 19. Theology and system, p. 158. 20. Theology and method, p. 172. 21. How to attain to theological fitness, p. 228. — The contents of the chapter on the Holy Scriptures (*De Scriptura Sacra*) are these: 1. Holy Scripture is for the Church of our time the only source and norm of Christian doctrine, p. 233. 2. In contradistinction to all other writings, Holy Scripture is the Word of God, p. 256. 3. Holy Scripture is the Word of God because it is inspired by God, p. 262. 4. The relation of the Holy Spirit to the writers of the Holy Scriptures, p. 275. 5. Objections to the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, p. 280 (difference of style in the various books of Scripture; the appeal to historical research; variants; supposed contradictions and erroneous statements; inaccurate citations of the Old Testament by New Testament writers; trifling matters and matters not becoming the Holy Spirit; solecisms, barbarisms, faulty constructions). 6. Historical data regarding the doctrine of inspiration, p. 320. 7. Luther and the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, p. 334. 8. Comprehensive characterization of modern theology in as far as it denies the inspiration of Scripture, p. 360. 9. Consequences of the rejection of inspiration, p. 367. 10. Attributes of Holy Scripture, p. 371 (its divine authority, p. 371; its divine efficacy, p. 381; its sufficiency, p. 383; its perspicuity, p. 386). 11. The witness of history in behalf of Scripture, p. 398 (homologoumena and antilegomena). 12. Integrity of the text of the Bible, p. 408. 13. The original text of Scripture and the translations, p. 415. 14. The use of Scripture in deciding doctrinal controversies, p. 422. 15. The authority of Scripture and the confessional documents (symbols), p. 427. 16. Scripture and exegesis, p. 434. — In the chapter on the Doctrine of God (*De Deo*) we find the following details: 1. Natural knowledge of God, p. 445. 2. Christian knowledge of God, p. 451. 3. The struggle of the Church in behalf of the Christian knowledge of God, p. 457 (the conflict with those who reject *three persons* in the Godhead, p. 459). 4. The conflict with those who reject *one* God, p. 461. 5. Objections raised against the consubstantiality or the unity of God, p. 466. 6. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity in the Old Testament, p. 474. 7. The Trinity incomprehensible to human reason, p. 480. 8. Ecclesiastical terminology in the service of the Christian knowledge of God, p. 490. —

Detailed presentation of the Scriptural teaching regarding the essence and attributes of God (*De essentia et attributis divinis*). A. The relation of the divine essence to the divine attributes and of the attributes to one another, p. 524. B. Various classifications of the divine attributes, p. 533. C. Negative attributes by which imperfections found in creatures are declared inapplicable to God: His unity, p. 536; His simplicity, p. 538; His immutability, p. 540; His infinity, p. 542; His omnipresence, p. 543; His eternity, p. 547. Positive attributes existing also in creatures, but in absolute perfection in God alone: His life, p. 549; His knowledge, p. 549; His wisdom, p. 556; reason and will in God, p. 557; the holiness of God, p. 561; the goodness, mercy, love, grace, and kindness of God, p. 565. — In the chapter on the creation of the universe and of man (*De creatione*) the following points are discussed: 1. The source of knowledge for the doctrine of creation, p. 570. 2. Essence and concept of creation, p. 571. 3. The space of time within which creation took place, p. 572. 4. The order followed in the work of creation, p. 572. 5. Detailed account of the work of creation according to days, p. 574. Dichotomy and trichotomy, p. 581. Unity of the human race, p. 582. Particular facts relating to the Biblical account of creation, p. 583. The destiny of the universe, p. 583. Concluding Remarks, p. 586. — The contents of his chapter on Divine Providence, or the Preservation and Government of the Universe (*De Providentia Dei*) the author has sketched as follows: 1. The concept of the providence of God, and objections raised against it, p. 587. 2. The relation of the providence of God to secondary causes, p. 592. 3. The providence of God and sin, p. 595. 4. God permitting sin, p. 596. 5. Divine providence and human liberty, p. 597. — In the chapter on the Angels (*De Angelis*) we find the following doctrinal matters discussed: 1. The existence of angels and the time of their creation, p. 603. 2. The names of angels, p. 603. 3. Quality and abilities of the angels, p. 604. 4. Number of angels and differences among them, p. 609. 5. Good and evil angels, p. 610. 6. Good angels and their activities, p. 611. 7. Evil angels; their activities and their eternal punishment, p. 613. — Perhaps the most important chapter in this volume, from the viewpoint of practical importance, is the concluding chapter on the Doctrine of Man (*Anthropologia*), which divides and subdivides as follows: A. MAN BEFORE THE FALL (*De statu hominis ante lapsum*): 1. The creation of man after the image of God, p. 617. 2. The constituent elements of the divine image, p. 618. 3. The image of God in the wider and in the proper meaning, p. 621. 4. The relation of the divine image to human nature, p. 622. 5. Immediate effects of the divine image in man, p. 624. 6. The purpose of the divine image, p. 625. 7. Woman and the divine image, p. 626. B. MAN AFTER THE FALL (*De statu peccati*). *General View of Sin* (*De peccato in genere*): 1. The concept of sin, p. 631. 2. The Law and sin, p. 633. 3. The knowledge of the divine Law obligating all men, p. 635. 4. The cause of sin, p. 638. 5. The consequences of sin, p. 641. *Hereditary Sin* (*De peccato originali*): 1. The concept of hereditary sin, p. 645. 2. Effects of hereditary corruption on the intellect and will of man, p. 652. 3. Negative and positive side of hereditary corruption, p. 656. 4. The subject in which hereditary corruption inheres, p. 659.

5. Consequences of hereditary corruption, p. 661. *Actual Sins*: 1. Denomination and concept of actual sins, p. 669. 2. Causes of actual sins: *Causae peccati actualis intra hominem*, p. 670; *causae peccati actualis extra hominem*, p. 671. 3. The Scriptural teaching regarding offense, p. 672. 4. The Scriptural teaching regarding temptation, p. 674. 5. Classification and denomination of actual sins, p. 675 (a. distinguishing actual sins in accordance with the different cooperation of the human will, p. 676; b. *peccata actualia* in their relation to the conscience of man, p. 677; c. classification of sins by means of the object affected, p. 678; d. classification of sins by degree, p. 678; e. *peccata mortalia et venalia* [mortal and remissible sins], p. 680; f. dominant and non-dominant sins, p. 681; g. participation in the sins of others, p. 681; h. crying sins [*peccata clamantia*], p. 682; i. the sin against the Holy Spirit, p. 683).

All these discussions are oriented step for step by Scripture and the Lutheran Confessions. The entire volume, like the two preceding it, is a conscientious effort to reproduce God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure, and also in this volume the guiding influence of Luther's labors in the domain of dogmatics is unmistakable — certainly a feature reflecting credit on the oft-despised Luther and on the faith and courage of Dr. Pieper. — Regarding the spirit and animus of his work the author says: "Also in the present volume I have endeavored to make an objective presentation of matters. In some parts sharp language has been used. Wherever this occurs, it was called for by the importance of the matter. The point to be established was to show that any theology which wants to draw and regulate Christian doctrine, not from and by the Holy Scriptures, but from and by the *ego* of the theologizing individual, is neither Christian nor scientific, but the opposite of both. I have also in this volume stated repeatedly that I am aware of the fact that there is such a thing as theological inconsistency, and that, accordingly, there is a possibility of a person's holding a different faith in his heart and in the presence of God than when he is composing his writings." The author is conscious of the fact that the polemics of Christians, like every other doctrinal effort of theirs, must be supported by the Christ-mind, that is, they must be put forward in a spirit of meekness. He says: "We American Lutherans of the 'strict confessional type' have not the least cause to claim superiority over others. We should surely swim in the same wrong stream with others if the grace of God had not placed us in entirely different conditions as regards church-work. We are the second and third generation [of Missourians], and as such we have received our theological training under the most favorable conditions imaginable. We were made acquainted with the sources, not only of the theology of the old Church, of the Reformation, and its dogmaticians, but also with the character of modern theology and the results attained by it. Parallel with this ran the constant admonition of our teachers not to substitute for the divine authority of the Scriptures any human authority, not even the authority of Luther and the confessional writings [of the Lutheran Church]. During the last session [at our Seminary] the admonition addressed to our students ran as follows: 'Let none of you enter the ministry if he entertains scruples

regarding the Scriptural character of any doctrine contained in the Lutheran Confessions. Let any one who is still harboring doubts seek a frank interview with any one of his teachers.' Beginning with the first sermon of the first year of the theological curriculum, every theological phrase sounding a note of pretended learning and all precocious rhetoric was mercilessly pruned [by the censor] on the ground that the *usus didacticus* of the Holy Scriptures must be accorded the first place. [Our students were told that] their aim must be so to preach that, as far as the pastor's work is concerned, the secure may be roused from their carnal security by the unmitigated preaching of the Law and alarmed consciences may be assured of the grace of God and of their salvation by the unconditioned Gospel (*satisfactio vicaria*). Moreover, we made the most of the fact that we were surrounded at all times by enemies: Rome, the fanatical sects, insincere Lutherans, down to the Unitarians and the anti-christian lodges. The conflict with these opponents compelled us to engage in continuous, intensive study of the Christian doctrine in our congregational work, at pastoral conferences, and at synodical conventions. We should, indeed, be blind if we failed to observe the weaknesses which have at all times existed in our church-body. It has been, and still is, difficult to apply and maintain the correct practise in some congregations. We have also suffered secessions from our body which have greatly humiliated us. On the other hand, we are assured by the grace of God that the doctrine prevailing among us is the Christian doctrine revealed in the Holy Scriptures and witnessed unto by the Lutheran Confessions, and that, accordingly, this doctrine alone has the right of way with us. This *Christian Dogmatics*, in its thetical as well as in its antithetical statements, desires to be judged from this viewpoint. *Soli Deo Gloria!*"

Dr. Pieper concluded his treatise in April, 1924. His work will go down to future generations as the dogmatic standard, alongside of the works of Walther and his earlier colleagues, of the Missouri Synod. This notice had to be written during leisure moments at a synodical convention and while traveling, in order not to delay the announcement of its completion to our readers. The pastoral conference of the Central District of the Missouri Synod, in regular session at Fort Wayne, Ind., on June 25, went on record asking for the speedy preparation of an English edition of this work. — The publishing concern of the Missouri Synod is to be congratulated on the painstaking labor which its composers, proof-readers, and binders have bestowed on this publication, which for a long time will remain the pride of its press.

DAV.

The Lord's Prayer. By *William Dallmann*. 259 pages, 5½×8. \$1.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The Lord's Prayer by Pastor Dallmann, now on the market in its second edition, deserves to be read by many. The treatises on the various parts of the Lord's Prayer are eminently Scriptural and therefore will be in a large degree helpful to the readers. It is characteristic of Dallmann's writings that they are filled with quotations from the Scriptures, with Scriptural references, and Scriptural language. The style is Dallmannian: short sentences, pregnant expressions, pointed sayings. Pastor Dallmann does not try to say a thing, but he says it; he does not preach

over the heads of the people, but he preaches to them. The divisions of the various treatises into smaller portions under separate heads suggest to us that the book can well be used for the purpose of family devotions. We herewith give a few samples taken from the third treatise, "Our Father's Kingdom:—

"A kingdom is a king's dominion, every person and thing over which a king is ruler. Our Father's kingdom extends over all: heaven and all its glories, earth and all it contains, hell and all its infernal spirits. 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.' Ps. 24, 1; 47, 2. 'The heavens are Thine, the earth also is Thine; as for the world and the fulness thereof, Thou hast founded them.' Ps. 89, 11. 'The Lord is a great God and a great King above all gods. In His hand are the deep places of the earth; the strength of the hills is His also. The sea is His, and He made it, and His hands formed the dry land.' Ps. 95, 3—5. 'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created.' Rev. 4, 11. 'Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven und in the earth is Thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as Head above all.' 1 Chron. 29, 11. . . .

"There is not only the Kingdom of Power, but also the Kingdom of Grace; not only a natural kingdom, but also a supernatural kingdom; not only a physical kingdom, but also a spiritual kingdom.

"The Kingdom of Grace is called the 'kingdom of heaven,' Matt. 3, 2; and justly so, for it comes from heaven, Luke 2, 8—11; it reaches as far as the heavens, 1 Tim. 2, 4; 2 Pet. 3, 9; Matt. 28, 19; it makes us heavenly, Phil. 3, 20; and it leads to heaven, John 14, 2, 3; 17, 24. . . .

"This is the kingdom of the redeemed, and they adore and worship Christ as their God; this is the kingdom of the children of God, and they obey God as their Father; this is the kingdom of the royal priesthood, and they own allegiance to no man, be he prince or priest; they acknowledge no authority, be it imperial or pontifical; Christ, and Christ alone, is their Head, and Him they worship willingly, Him they adore ardently, Him they homage heartily. . . .

"Yes, even in the Old Testament times there was a kingdom of God; Israel was God's people and realm; God was Israel's King; Jerusalem was His residence; the Temple, His palace; the Ark of the Covenant, His throne. Glorious as this was, it was only the shadow of the reality, the promise of the good things to come. The budding promise blossomed forth in glorious beauty when the Lion of Judah leaped upon the scene and said: 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the Gospel.' Mark 1, 15. . . .

"But as a matter of fact accomplished in time, heaven and earth, violently torn asunder by Adam's sin in Paradise, have been knit together by the coming of Christ into the flesh. By His birth in Bethlehem, by His circumcision in the Temple, by His blameless life in Israel, by His agony in Gethsemane, by His sufferings under Caiaphas, by His scourging under Pilate, by His shameful death on Calvary, and by His burial, He has

conquered heaven's foes and out of the spoils has carved a kingdom for Himself, and so it is called the kingdom of the Son, the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. By His descent into hell He has heralded His conquest to the spirits in prison; by His glorious resurrection He has proclaimed His victory to all the sons of men; by His triumphant ascension He has made known to heaven's angelic hosts that His great mission is fulfilled; by His sitting at the right hand of God He defends and extends His reign. . . .

"This kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom, and it comes in a spiritual way from the Spirit of God to the spirit of man. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; that is, you are not a Christian because you eat or do not eat pork; because you eat or do not eat meat on Friday or during Lent; because you wear or do not wear a gold button or a broad-brimmed hat. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; that is, Christianity does not consist in big stone buildings with towering spires, and sounding chimes, and stained-glass windows, and carpeted floors, and cushioned pews, and paid choirs, and grand organs, and ornamental pulpits, and carved altars, and marble fonts, and bronze lecterns, and elaborate liturgy, and imposing rites, and magnificent ceremonies, and feast-days, and fast-days, and fairs, and bazaars, and theatricals, and concerts, and kitchens, and committees, and societies, and guilds, and bands, and Sons of this and Daughters of that. To look at the doings of many modern churches the conviction is pressed upon us that the foregoing is their conception of the kingdom of God, and when that is accomplished, they complacently fold their hands in their lap and go to sleep. That is an entirely erroneous conception. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost; 'for he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God.' Rom. 14, 17. 18. . . .

"The times are out of joint; God has made you a Christian for the purpose of doing your share to set them aright. The world is in darkness; God has made you a light to lighten the world. The world is full of corruption; God has made you a salt in the earth; do not lose your savor. . . . Every service is to see you in your accustomed place; the school is to know you as its helping friend; the congregational meeting is to have your presence, your advice, and your help; the neighborhood is to feel the influence of a godly character and a stainless life. . . . That sick woman in the alley back of your house, — can't you do anything for her? Those ragamuffins in the lane, — can't you dress and wash them and take them to Sunday-school?

"'Thy kingdom come' urges one and all to pray, work, and give money for churches and colleges, students and missionaries, for English missions and German missions, Colored missions and Indian missions, Jewish missions and heathen missions. . . .

"'Thy kingdom come' pleads for truth in science, for purity in painting, for nobility in music, for peace in politics, for charity in Church. . . .

"If you pray this prayer and practise it, you will be doing the Lord's will, and blessed will you be at the Lord's coming. In doing God's will, God is with you."

Fritz.

Book of Concord. Concordia Edition. English only. 520 pages, $7\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$. \$3.50, postpaid. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Our pastors ought to read the Book of Concord not only in its English translation, but also in the original Latin or German. The *Concordia Triglotta* is therefore the book which ought to be found in the study of pastors. We are glad to report that the *Triglotta*, put on the market in 1921, has had a large sale.

We are immensely pleased to announce that our Publishing House has gotten out the English translation of the *Book of Concord* together with the "Historical Introductions," which alone cover 256 pages, in a separate volume. And we are no less pleased to know that the price of this new Concordia English edition of the *Book of Concord* is most reasonable, only \$3.50. We have in our churches many thousands of intelligent men and women; these ought to buy up the entire new English edition of the *Book of Concord* within the next few months. We believe that they will, if our pastors call attention to the book and explain its merits to them. Our people would derive much benefit from reading and studying it. Particularly at this time it is important that our people know what true Lutheranism stands for. Our people, of course, ought to read and study their Bible first. From the Bible—not from any other source—they should learn the great truths which God has revealed for the salvation of the world. But the *Book of Concord* is a true exposition of the Bible doctrine as it is taught by our Lutheran Church and confessed over against the large number of those who have adulterated it or deny it altogether. As to our Lutheran doctrine, our lay people ought to have first-hand information, and this they can get from the *Book of Concord*. Pastors who persuaded their people to buy it will confer a blessing upon themselves, the people, and the Church at large.

F. B. FITZ.

From Advent to Advent. Sermons on Free Texts. By the Rev. L. Buchheimer. 354 pages, 6×9 . \$2.50, postpaid. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The Rev. L. Buchheimer has for many years been pastor of the Lutheran Church of Our Redeemer in St. Louis. The sermons offered by him in his latest book were originally written for his pulpit. Being sermons on free texts, they will no doubt be eagerly bought by many young and old pastors. They should be studied as other sermons should be studied by the preacher,—not for the sake of reproduction, but for the sake of suggestion. After a preacher has prayerfully and carefully studied his text on the basis of the original and in the light of other Scripture-passages and has made his sermon-sketch, he may and ought to read commentaries and sermons for the purpose of getting suggestive material. In this way the preacher will remain a Bible-student and ever be original and fresh in his sermonizing. As to the homiletical make-up of the sermon, we would not bind a preacher to iron-clad homiletical rules,—that would make sermonizing too mechanical,—but we must demand that he preach the text, present its truths in logical order, make the proper applications, and supply the needs of his people. We hope that Pastor Buchheimer's latest book of sermons will not

only be helpful to preachers, in the way indicated, but will also be bought and read by laymen. The good, smooth English style of the book adds to its usefulness.

FRTZ.

The Destruction of Jerusalem. By *L. H. Becker*. 70 pages, 5×7½. 55 cts., postpaid. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

In putting this book on the market, our Concordia Publishing House writes:—

"The wish has often been expressed to have the story of the destruction of Jerusalem, such as it has appeared from times immemorial as an appendix to the German hymn-book, made available also for the English reading public. The Juvenile Literature Board took this matter under serious advisement several years ago and concluded that a special book should be published to contain this story. Mr. Becker, a member of the Board, was chosen for the task of editing and revising Dean Milman's *History of the Destruction of Jerusalem*, which is drawn from Josephus.

"Mr. Becker has well accomplished his task, which required good tact and judgment, not only in the inclusions, but also in the exclusions. It was the wish of the Board that the story should not be too long; on the other hand, the Board desired that reasonable completeness of the story should not be sacrificed for the sake of brevity.

"The book has been issued as one of our well-known Red Book Series, and several illustrations have been added. The text is printed in large, readable type. The binding is substantial and good.

"The publishers venture to express the hope that the encouragement which we have received to produce the book may be justified by the market which it finds."

FRTZ.

Statistical Year-Book of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States for the Year 1923. \$1.00, net, postpaid. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Not only every pastor of our Synod, but also many laymen ought to purchase a copy of Synod's *Statistical Year-Book*. In nineteen separate departments it gives much valuable statistical information. "The book is getting to be," as the publishers say in their announcement, "quite a little Missouri Synod cyclopedia of facts and figures." It is gotten out by the statistician of Synod, the Rev. Mr. Eckhardt. Any one who is acquainted with the cost of type-setting will know that about 200 pages of figures cannot be produced for the price for which the book is sold.

FRTZ.

Home Department Questions on Primary Leaflets. Nos. 17—24. Complete sets of eight lessons, enclosed in an envelope. 5 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Our Concordia Publishing House says: "This is a new venture in our series of Sunday-school publications, and it is undertaken in deference to the wish expressed by a few and subsequently supported by a few additional missionaries in our Synod, who deplore the absence of a means of reaching an undoubtedly existing audience in rural districts, which for physical reasons cannot be brought to Sunday-school. The plan of the

promoters of this undertaking is to send our *Primary Leaflets* to such children and to furnish, at the same time, a question sheet on which the children thus enrolled in a sort of Home Department of the Sunday-school may write their answers and send them on to the Sunday-school.

"The whole matter is at present in an experimental stage, and the Sunday-school Board of the Missouri Synod, under whose auspices these sheets are published, will be glad to receive suggestive communications, which may be addressed to Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, D. D., 3705 Texas Ave., St. Louis, Mo."

Fritz.

Liturgy and Agenda. Library Edition. \$3.50, net. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The *Liturgy and Agenda* used in the church-services ought to be purchased by the congregation and left in the church. The pastor, however, ought to have a copy of his own on his desk, so that he can become well acquainted with the contents of the book and also carefully select and read what he desires to use in the regular church-service and on special occasions. The Library Edition of the *Liturgy and Agenda* is a cheaper edition, gotten out for this purpose. It differs from the *de luxe* edition in being bound in board covers with plain black cloth. It will lend itself to shelving purposes. Our pastors will desire to own the Library Edition.

Fritz.

Function of the Church in Industry. By Dr. Frederic Cook Morehouse. (National Association of Manufacturers, 50 Church St., New York City.)

In this pamphlet of fourteen pages Dr. Morehouse presents "some of the great problems involved in a consideration of what should be the proper attitude of church organizations towards industrial questions." The line of argument is summed up in the following words: "The Church cannot become the propagandist for any social or political program. It is difficult for many to see why. On what they deem to be sufficient reasoning, they accept for themselves certain policies or programs which they believe essential for the well-being of the nation — socialism or anti-socialism, the single tax, organized labor, sovietism, prohibition, or any other program, good or bad, wise or unwise. Believing in such a program themselves, they assume that their reasoning should also be that of the Church, and that the Church should be committed to it. On the contrary, it is no part of the duty of the Church to sanction particular programs looking even to better social conditions. Her part is to proclaim principles and leave to the State, which, ideally, would mean her own enlightened children functioning in another sphere, the formulation of those principles in a program or policy."

Fritz.

Composition for College Students. By Joseph M. Thomas, University of Minnesota; Frederick A. Manchester, University of Wisconsin; Franklin W. Scott, University of Illinois. 577 pages. (The Macmillan Company, New York.)

This book was first published in 1922. Since then it has been reprinted three times. It is an excellent text-book for those who desire to learn the

art of composition. The table of contents gives the following chapter-heads: A Preface to Students, The Whole Composition, The Paragraph, The Sentence, The Word, Argument, Description, Narration, Artistic Narrative, or Stories, An Epilog to Teachers. In an appendix, specimens of exposition, argument, description, and narration are given. A fifth appendix adds a Handbook, giving valuable reference material on diction, grammar, punctuation, etc.

The entire make-up of the book shows that the authors understand the needs of the student and know how to supply these in a masterly way. Any one, a preacher, for instance, who is compelled to write and to speak will do well to purchase this book, study it, and keep it in his library for ready reference.

Fritz.

Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament. By *Prof. William Hersey Davis, M. A., Th. D.* 251 pages. \$2.00, net. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

"This book is a beginner's book," says the author in his preface. "It is the result of classroom experience of many years. The need and preparation of a beginner's class in Greek has determined the method and order of presentation. The Greek of the New Testament is the *Koine* of the first century A. D. It is presented as such in this book. The historical development of the Greek language has been kept in mind. No forms or words are given which do not occur in the Greek New Testament. All illustrations and sentences for translation have been taken from the New Testament. Those words which are of the most frequent occurrence are presented first. In this book especial stress has been laid upon the meaning of the cases, the prepositions, and the tenses, wherein most beginner's books have been faulty."

Dr. A. T. Robertson, a well-known Greek scholar, has written an introduction to the *Grammar*. He says: "In my experience of thirty-five years as a teacher of the Greek New Testament I have always had numbers of men who floundered over the cases, the prepositions, the tenses, the voices, the modes, because they had learned these basal things in the old, unscientific way. It is like pulling eye-teeth for such a one to learn that the genitive is not the whence-case, but only the case of kind or genus, and that the ablative is the whence-case. If one gets it into his head that the root idea of tense is time, he may never get it out, and he will therefore never understand the beauty of the Greek tense, the most wonderful development in the history of language. Professor Davis is absolutely at home in the new science of language and, I may add, is the most brilliant student of Greek that I have ever had. One should, if possible, take the college course in ancient Greek. He needs this background and this contact with the glorious period of the Greek language. But the New Testament is the chief glory of the Greek tongue, and one can begin it in the right way under Professor Davis's tutelage."

The pastor who has taken such a course in classical Greek as is given during four years at our colleges will find Davis's *Grammar* to be an elementary book, — it is intended to be such, — but even such a pastor, if he has in the course of years neglected to continue his study of Greek, can

profit by studying Davis's *Grammar*; for he will thereby receive a new stimulus with greater pleasure to read and study his Greek New Testament. Those who know no Greek, as well as those who have taken only an elementary course, will find Davis's *Grammar* just the book which they need for the purpose of learning to read their New Testament in its original language. For such the book has been written. FRITZ.

The Christ of the Logia. By Prof. A. T. Robertson. 247 pages, 5×7½. \$2.00. (Geo. H. Doran Company, New York.)

The *Logia* referred to in the title are the hypothetical *Book of Sayings* used by the author of the "first gospel," presumably Mark. By conceding to the New Testament critics the origin of Mark out of the *Logia*, also called *Q*, and the derivation of Matthew and Luke from Mark, Professor Robertson does more than "facing with candor the books of modern research"; he attempts the impossible by uniting a critical theory, based on a naturalistic conception of revelation, with faith in the divine Christ and His atonement for sin. When Professor Robertson discusses, on the basis of linguistic science, the evidences of the deity of Christ, His claims of power and knowledge, and the harmony of John's gospel with the synoptics, he is on a field in which he is master. But even these chapters are enjoyable only so long as we forget the concession made in the very title of the book. Chapter 11, "The Life of Christ in Mark's Gospel in the Light of the World War," is mere padding, and anachronistic at that. Why, at this late day, should a scholar reprint lectures delivered in an army camp in 1918? This chapter, in which John and Jesus are made parallel to Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson as "men of destiny," Christ's choice of a band of teachers for training is compared to the training-schools of the American army, and the parable Mark 4, 26—29 is used to illustrate a law which destroyed the German Kaiser, is really unworthy of a theologian. GRAEBNER.

The Theory of Ethics. By Arthur Kenyon Rogers. 197 pages, 5½×8. Cloth. (The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y.)

A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics. Edited by Shailer Mathews, D. D., LL. D., and Gerald Birney Smith, D. D. 513 pages, 7½×10¼. Cloth. Reprint edition, \$3.00. (The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y.)

In the first book, *The Theory of Ethics*, Arthur K. Rogers endeavors to establish the principles of ethics upon a foundation other than that of natural and revealed law. The thesis which he proposes to defend is that "goodness is no specific quality inherent in an object, but the outcome of some distinctive attitude which we adopt toward such a quality." (p. 11.) "So long as I approve a thing, for me it is good." (p. 17.) The criterion of the good is pleasure or the feeling of satisfaction. This, however, is not to be understood in the sense of historical hedonism. (p. 33.) For we aim not only at pleasure, nor is mere pleasurable-ness by itself good. (p. 40.) True ethics aims to tell us what is really our good, the permanent good, the good on the whole, and in the long run. (p. 41.) The essential business of the ethical or rational life is to compare ends or courses of conduct as wholes. (p. 47.) That only determines the ethical "ought,"

which can be turned into a law for all men and all occasions. (p. 66.) I am never to act otherwise than in such a manner that I could also will that my maxim should become a universal law. (p. 65.) That is the criterion of moral good, which differs from natural good in that we not only find it existing, but judge that it "ought to be." (p. 86.) There is left therefore only one thing that might seem to have some title to be called a universal good—action regarded as the expression of an inner disposition or state of mind. This is a "good," because, as a source of conduct, the inner attitude is a necessary condition of human happiness or satisfaction. It is also a moral good in so far as it recognizes as necessary to happiness the acceptance of the moral restraint and so itself comes under the judgment of the "ought." (p. 88.) These quotations illustrate the author's theory of ethics. This theory, however, is neither new, nor does it solve the problem of ethics considered from the naturalistic point of view. The author has not answered the question: Why must I conform to that which is manifestly good, though it is not a universal maxim, and though I have no "inner disposition or state of mind" that prompts me to do it? This *cruz* the author does not solve, but rather circumvents it by arguing in a circle. It is evident that the "ought" of ethics can be explained reasonably only in connection with the natural and the revealed Law of God.

Concerning the other book offered by the Macmillan Company for review, *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, there is, no doubt, a great demand for one-volume dictionaries of religion and ethics of this kind. While no pastor can afford to be without larger works of reference, he may at times resort also to a smaller work in which the subject on which he desires information is presented briefly and summarily. However, even the one-volume dictionary must be thoroughly reliable and true to facts, whether historical or doctrinal. To this standard, Mathews and Smith's *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* does not conform. Practically all articles in it have been written by outspoken Liberalists, and accordingly they present the modernistic view of destructive higher critics. This renders the book practically worthless and downright harmful, since the reader is not made acquainted with both sides of the question. Two samples may show the lexicographer's method of presenting matters. Under the heading of "Deluge" we read: "The usual term for the Biblical Flood described in a secondary element of the Yahvistic narrative and the priestly sections of Gen. 6—8. The story belongs in a cycle of similar traditions, widely diffused over the world, the most conspicuous exceptions being Arabia, Egypt, Central Africa, Japan, and Northern Asia. Of these traditions a certain number embody reminiscences of separate local inundations, . . . while others are mythical explanations of natural phenomena. . . . On the other hand, the Biblical story, together with the classical Greek legend of Deucalion . . . and the later East Indian traditions, point clearly to an ultimate source in Babylonia. The relation of these traditions was already manifest from the fragments of Berossus and is now placed beyond all doubt by the decipherment of the original tablets, some of which date from B. C. 2100. Here it is related how the gods sent a flood to destroy Shurippak. . . . The story has probably grown round some tradition of a tidal flood, accompanied by a cyclonic storm, which overwhelmed the

neighborhood of Shurippak; but it is so heavily colored by mythical elements that no great account can be taken of its historical significance. The chief value of the story lies in a comparative study of the underlying moral and religious ideas."

Again, under "Old Testament," we read in part: "The value of the Old Testament is to-day seen in the fact that it is the record of a long period in the history of the purest religion that the world knew prior to the rise of Christianity. It shows us that religion in the making. It reveals to us the faults and virtues of the makers of the Hebrew religion and thus furnishes warning and inspiration to us in the task of meeting the religious needs of our own day. Further, it throws a bright light upon the New Testament and so contributes greatly to our understanding of the rise and development of early Christianity."

These are fair samples of what the book offers. In some other places the modernistic views which brush aside facts in the interest of unbelief are set forth even more emphatically. In view of this it is clear why this book has generally failed to meet with the approval of reviewers who are orthodox in the true sense of the word. Our own verdict agrees with their condemnation of the book.

MUELLER.

Evidences of Christianity. By *John Talmadge Bergen, A. B., A. M., D. D.* 144 pages, 5×7½. Cloth. \$1.00. (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Pastor Bergen's *Evidences of Christianity* is a brief and popular statement of the usual proof for Christianity. It is a fine popular contribution to the rapidly increasing literature on Christian evidences, which the attacks of destructive higher critics, the onslaughts of skeptics and lampooners, and the frightful increase of unbelief in general are steadily calling forth. The purpose of this new book on Christian Evidences is not to offer new proofs in behalf of the truth, but to arrange and set forth in a clear and interesting way the main arguments for Christianity. As such it will be found helpful to all who desire a popular work on Apologetics.

MUELLER.

Tutankhamen and Egyptology. By *Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph. D., D. D.* 100 pages, 4¾×6¾. (Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.)

This charming little book makes interesting reading for those desiring information that relates to the recent discoveries in Egypt. In six chapters the following subjects are treated: "The Recent Excavations in Egypt," "Tutankhamen and Egyptian History," "Inscriptions of Tutankhamen's Reign," "Egyptology" (or Egyptian archeology), "Egyptian Culture and Religion," "Technical Egyptian Terms." To these is added a chapter on Chronology, a valuable Bibliography, and an Index. As editor of the *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, of which the author is the rector, and as editor of the *Anglican Theological Review*, the author has contributed a large number of instructive articles on Egyptological subjects. Much of the material treated in these periodicals is offered here in condensed form. Like many other scholars the author believes that the "Exodus from Egypt did not take place all at once. In other words, all

the tribes did not leave Egypt at one and the same time. Simeon and Levi left as early as 1375 B. C., Ashur left earlier than 1313 B. C., Gad, Dan, Naphtali, Zebulun, and also Issachar and Reuben probably left long before 1225 B. C. Judah and the Joseph tribes formed the great 'Exodus' in the time of Merneptah." (p. 50.) This supposition does not agree with the Bible, but is a common theory by which the Biblical record is made to harmonize with the account from Babylonian and other sources.

MUELLER.

There Are Sermons in Books. By *William L. Stidger*. 232 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Cloth. \$1.50, net.

Critical Hours in the Preacher's Life. By *Ernest Clyde Wareing, D. D.*, *Litt. D.* 174 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Cloth. \$1.25, net.

Cyclopedia of Sermon Outlines. By *Rev. Acquila Webb, D. D., LL. D.* 336 pages, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{3}{4}$. Cloth. \$3.00, net. (George H. Doran Co., New York, N. Y.)

The title of the first book mentioned explains its purpose, which consists in showing how literature may be employed in preaching. The method which the author suggests is simple. Choosing a Bible-text, the preacher connects the lesson of that text with the general moral truth set forth in a certain book, which he then proceeds to discuss in his sermon. Works outlined in this way are: *The Shoes of Happiness*, *The Resurrection* (Leo Tolstoy), *The Great Hunger* (Johann Bojer), *Modern Tendencies in Sculpture* (Lorado Taft), etc. Thus poetry, fiction, and non-fiction are to be used in the pulpit in place of the Bible. That such preaching may interest hearers who do not know how to value the Bible we do not deny, but that it will fail to satisfy earnest Christians who attend the houses of worship for the purpose of hearing God's Word is evident. Besides, it ultimately relegates to oblivion the precious Word, which God Himself has made the only source and standard of faith and morals. Of course, we do not object to an occasional discussion of a popular work of note in a lecture before the societies of a church. However, to substitute for the Bible Hugo's *Les Misérables* or Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup* or Dostojefsky's *Crime and Punishment* is as much of an absurdity as if a physician would practise his profession according to the instructions of a witch or medicine man. Only a person utterly devoid of the true sense of spiritual values can consistently resort to the method suggested in this book. Indeed, such a course of action results from utter alienation from God and His Word. What the author recommends is really only jazz in preaching.

As editor of a Christian weekly and as pastor for many years Dr. Wareing, the author of *Critical Hours in the Preacher's Life*, has had ample opportunity of becoming acquainted with the responsibilities, struggles, prejudices, and temptations of a minister's life. Out of these experiences this book has come forth, as the author states in the preface: "It [the book] found its inception, not in the intellectual life, through any analytical process, but in the repeated wounding of the heart, by the failure of those whom I had known to love and to trust. During the past six years I have seen almost a score of ministers fall from the heights

of spiritual leadership to the depths of shame and disgrace. . . . There is a depth to which a minister may fall, where his ignominy is more distressing than the ravages of physical pain, where his condemnation is more searching than that given unto any other man. . . . Out of this vision of wreckage and tragedy during the critical hours of a minister's life came the following discussion." The purpose of really helping the young pastor by discussing his problems and difficulties is revealed on every page. The spirit in which it is written is that of fatherly love and of deep sympathy with those tempted and distressed. The first two parts, entitled: "A Cry from the Depths" and "Looking into the Depths," merit earnest reading by all pastors. However, the two remaining parts: "Escape from the Depths" and "The Level of Deliverance," are less valuable, since they fail to state the cure clearly and completely. According to the author the road to recovery lies in the discovery of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of true Christianity. What these terms mean is not lucidly set forth. Surely every minister should have discovered Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, and true Christianity *before* entering upon his holy office. In other words, no one ought to become a preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ who is not deeply rooted in that precious Word which testifies of Christ. However, if the author means to say that the road of discovery lies in a more intimate communion with Christ through faith, by prayer, and the study of God's Word, he is right. When the natural enthusiasm with which the young minister takes up his work passes away, when he is made to realize his weakness and unworthiness, when sin assails and Satan buffets him, when worldly cares trouble him and dampen his ardor, there is no other help than that which Paul has pointed out in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, namely, the Word of God, which offers to him the same strength and consolation that is offered to the believing hearers. Then also the minister will see the true purpose of the personal chastenings which God has permitted to come to him. Every tribulation should serve to make him a truer Christian, a better pastor, and a more effective preacher of the Gospel of Christ. The advice given in this book is along these lines, and its lessons are therefore worth considering, though the book contains also many statements to which we cannot agree.

Webb's *Cyclopedia of Sermon Outlines* has been received very favorably as a book offering to the busy pastor substantial help in preparing his sermons. The praise accorded it may hold with regard to the quantity of sermon outlines offered in the book, but certainly not with regard to their quality. Sermon outlines are of true value only if they expound the text and apply the truths wrapped up in it. They must help the preacher to solve the great problem as to how to preach the everlasting and ever-necessary Gospel in its whole truth and meaning. Viewed from this point, the outlines of Dr. Webb and his coworkers are greatly lacking. As samples of what the author offers we quote the following: Shifting Responsibility. Text, Ex. 32, 24: "There came out this calf." I. Aaron blamed society. II. He blamed nature. (Contr. by W. L. Watkinson.) — Talebearing and Slander. Text, Lev. 19, 16: "Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer." I. Character is in the keeping and therefore at the mercy of

acquaintances. II. Character may be ruthlessly shattered by sinister whisperings. III. Character is so precious that its traducers should be loathed. (W. H. Jellie.) — Open and Secret Christians. Text, John 3, 2: "The same came to Jesus by night." I. Hypocrites overestimate the value of worldly friendships. II. They overestimate the effect of confession on friendship. III. They underestimate their own strength. (W. M. Taylor.)

These samples show how far these outlines deviate from the outlines of true Lutheran Gospel-preaching. Since they fail to emphasize the central doctrines, fully to evaluate the text, and logically to arrange the truths set forth in the text, they fall far behind the norm of good preaching in all churches. After all, it remains true that the minister's best help for sermon work is the Bible itself, studied regularly and conscientiously with the aid of a good commentary and with earnest prayer. However, if occasionally he is obliged to make use of outlines, the best should not be too good.

MUELLER.

The Sotarion Publishing Co., Buffalo, N. Y., offers **First Steps**, a four-page child's paper which teaches Bible History by the picture-reading method, and **Tell His Disciples — and Peter**, a liturgical order of service for Easter, by *Adolph T. Hanser*.

Augustana Book Concern has issued Grades III and IV of its **Graded Lessons in Luther's Small Catechism** and Bible History and Grades V, VI, VII and VIII of its **Graded Lessons on the Catechism**; also **Easter Echoes**, an Easter Program for the Sunday-school by *W. E. Pearson*; also two brochures by *C. J. Soedergren*: **Reason and Revelation** (22 pages) and **The Education of the Heart** (16 pages).

DAU.

Correction.

In July issue, page 197, line 18 from top, read "strength" for "struggle."

DAU.